arXiv:1701.02207v2 [math.NT] 27 Mar 2017

RAMIFICATION FILTRATION OF THE GALOIS GROUP OF A LOCAL FIELD VIA DEFORMATIONS

VICTOR ABRASHKIN

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a field of formal Laurent series with coefficients in a finite field of chracteristic p, $\mathcal{G}_{<p}$ — the maximal quotient of $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathcal{K}_{sep}/\mathcal{K})$ of period p and nilpotent class $< p$ and $\{\mathcal{G}_{<p}^{(v)}\}_{v\geqslant 0}$ — its filtration by ramification subgroups in the upper numbering. Let $\mathcal{G}_{<p} = G(\mathcal{L})$ be the identification of nilpotent Artin-Schreier theory: here $G(\mathcal{L})$ is the group obtained from a suitable profinite Lie $\mathbb{F}_p$-algebra $\mathcal{L}$ via the Campbell-Hausdorff composition law. We give a new proof of the construction of generators of the ideals $\mathcal{L}^{(v)}$ such that $G(\mathcal{L}^{(v)}) = \mathcal{G}_{<p}^{(v)}$ from [1]. Given $v_0 > 0$ we construct epimorphism of Lie algebras $\bar{\eta}^{\dagger} : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$ and the action Ω_U of the formal group $\alpha_p = \mathrm{Spec}\ \mathbb{F}_p[U]$, $U^p = 0$, of order p on $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$. Then $d\Omega_U = B^{\dagger}U$, where $B^{\dagger} \in \mathrm{Diff}\,\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$, and $\mathcal{L}^{v_0)} = (\bar{\eta}^{\dagger})^{-1}\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger[v_0]}$, where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger[v_0]}$ is the ideal of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$ generated by the elements of $B^{\dagger}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger})$.

Introduction

Everywhere in the paper v_0 is a fixed positive real number.

Suppose $s \in \mathbb{N}$. For any topological group G, we denote by $C_s(G)$ the closure of the subgroup of G generated by the commutators of order $\geqslant s$. If L is a toplogical Lie algebra then $C_s(L)$ is the closure of the ideal generated by commutators of degree $\geqslant s$. For any topological A-modules M and B we use the notation $M_B = M\hat{\otimes}_A B$.

If L is any Lie algebra over $\mathbb{F}_p$ of nilpotent class $< p$ (i.e. $C_p(L) = 0$) then we use the notation $G(L)$ for the p-group obtained from the set L via the Campbell-Hausdorff composition law $(l_1, l_2) \mapsto l_1 \circ l_2$, cf. Subsection 1.2.

Let $k = \mathbb{F}_{p^{N_0}}$. Consider a free pro-finite Lie algebra $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_k$ over k with the set of free generators $\{D_{an} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}^+(p), n \in \mathbb{Z}/N_0\} \cup \{D_0\}$, where $\mathbb{Z}^+(p)$ is the set of all natural numbers prime to p.

If σ is the absolute Frobenius automorphism of k (for any $\alpha \in k$, $\sigma(\alpha) = \alpha^p$) we agree to use the same symbol σ for its continuation to an automorphism of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_k$ such that $\sigma(D_{an}) = D_{a,n+1}$ and $\sigma D_0 = D_0$. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} := \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_k|_{\sigma=\mathrm{id}}$ is a free Lie algebra over $\mathbb{F}_p$. Clearly, $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} k = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_k$.

Date: March 27, 2017.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11S15, 11S20.

Key words and phrases. local field, Galois group, ramification filtration.

Set $\mathcal{L}=\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}/C_p(\widetilde{\mathcal{L}})$. Note that the images of D_{an} and D_0 in $\mathcal{L}_k$ (which will be denoted by the same symbols) give a fixed system of generators of $\mathcal{L}_k$. We also set for $n\in\mathbb{Z}/N_0$, $D_{0n}=\sigma^n(\alpha_0)D_0$, where α_0 is a fixed element from k such that $\mathrm{Tr}_{k/\mathbb{F}_p}\alpha_0=1$. From time-to-time we allow in the definition of D_{an} that $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ under the agreement that $D_{an}=D_{a,n \bmod N_0}$.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the enveloping algebra of $\mathcal{L}$ with augmentation ideal $\mathcal{J}$. Consider an element $e\in\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ such that in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}$

$$\widetilde{\exp}(e)\equiv 1+\sum_{1\leqslant s<p}\sum_{a_1,\dots,a_s}\eta(a_1,\dots,a_s)t^{-(a_1+\dots+a_s)}D_{a_10}\dots D_{a_s0} \bmod J_{\mathcal{K}}^p$$

(here $\widetilde{\exp}$ is the truncated exponential) where the "structural constants" $\eta(a_1\dots,a_s)\in k$ are such that $\widetilde{\exp}(e)$ is "diagonal modulo degree p" , cf. Subsection 1.3. Fix $f\in G(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})$ such that $\sigma f=e\circ f$ and consider the map η_e^0 from $\mathcal{G}:=\mathrm{Gal}(\mathcal{K}_{sep}/\mathcal{K})$ to $G(\mathcal{L})$ such that for any $\tau\in\mathcal{G}$, $\eta_e^0:\tau\mapsto(-f)\circ\tau(f)$. This map (due to the nilpotent version of the Artin-Schreier theory, cf. [2]), provides us with the induced identification $\eta_e:\mathcal{G}_{<p}\simeq G(\mathcal{L})$, where $\mathcal{G}_{<p}:=\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^pC_p(\mathcal{G})$ is the maximal quotient of $\mathcal{G}$ of period p and nilpotent class $<p$.

For $v\geqslant 0$, let $\mathcal{G}^{(v)}$ be the subgroup of ramification with upper number v. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_{<p}^{(v)}$ the image of $\mathcal{G}^{(v)}$ in $\mathcal{G}_{<p}$. Then $\eta_e(\mathcal{G}_{<p}^{(v)})=\mathcal{L}^{(v)}$ is an ideal in $\mathcal{L}$.

In this paper we give a substantially new proof of the main result from [1]. This result can be stated as follows.

For $\alpha\geqslant 0$ and $N\in\mathbb{N}$, introduce $\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-N}\in\mathcal{L}_k$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-N}=\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s<p\\ a_i,n_i}}a_1\eta(\bar{a},\bar{n})[\dots[D_{a_1n_1},D_{a_2n_2}],\dots,D_{a_sn_s}]\,.$$

Here:

— $\bar{a}=(a_1,\dots,a_s)$ and $\bar{n}=(n_1,\dots,n_s)$ with $n_1=0$;

— $\alpha=\alpha(\bar{a},\bar{n})=a_1p^{n_1}+a_2p^{n_2}+\dots+a_sp^{n_s}$;

— if $1\leqslant s_1<s_2<\dots<s_r=s$ and $n_1=\dots=n_{s_1}>\dots>n_{s_{r-1}+1}=\dots=n_{s_r}\geqslant -N$ then

$$\eta(\bar{a},\bar{n}):=\sigma^{n_{s_1}}\eta(a_1,\dots,a_{s_1})\dots\sigma^{n_{s_r}}\eta(a_{s_{r-1}+1},\dots,a_{s_r})\,,$$

otherwise, $\eta(\bar{a},\bar{n})=0$.

Theorem 0.1. *For any $v\geqslant 0$, there is $\widetilde{N}(v)$ such that if $N\geqslant\widetilde{N}(v)$ is fixed then the ideal $\mathcal{L}^{(v)}$ is the minimal ideal in $\mathcal{L}$ such that its extension of scalars $\mathcal{L}_k^{(v)}$ contains all $\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-N}$ with $\alpha\geqslant v$.*

Our method can be briefly described as follows.

First, we introduce a decreasing central filtration by the ideals $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}(1)\supset\dots\supset\mathcal{L}(s)\supset\dots$ and prove that $\mathcal{L}(p)\subset\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)}$. This gives us the

projection $\eta_{\bar{e}} : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}) := G(\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{L}(p))$ and it remains to describe the ideal $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$ of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}) = \eta_{\bar{e}}(\mathcal{G}_{<p}^{(v_0)})$.

Then we:

a) introduce a lift $\mathcal{V} : \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$ is a Lie algebra over $\mathbb{F}_p$ of nilpotent class $< p$ with a central filtration $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}(s)$ such that $\mathcal{V}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}(s)) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}(p) = 0$;

b) prove the existence of a group epimorphism $\eta_{\bar{e}^{\dagger}} : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger})$ such that $\mathcal{V}\eta_{\bar{e}^{\dagger}} = \eta_{\bar{e}}$;

c) introduce an action of the group $\mathbb{Z}/p$ on $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$;

d) prove that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$ is the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}/p$, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)} \supset \mathcal{V}(\gamma(\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V}))$ and the induced action of $\mathbb{Z}/p$ on $\bar{\mathcal{L}}/\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$ is trivial (Note that this condition is very difficult to study because it involves very complicated group composition law coming from the Campbell-Hausdorff formula.);

e) the above action of the group $\mathbb{Z}/p$ comes from the co-action $\Omega_U : \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger} \otimes \mathbb{F}_p[U]$ of the group scheme $\alpha_p = \mathbb{F}_p[U]$ such that $U^p = 0$ and the coaddition is such that $\Delta U = U \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes U$;

f) if $d\Omega_U = B^{\dagger}U$ is the differential of Ω_U, where $B^{\dagger} \in \mathrm{Diff}\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$, then the conditions from above item d) mean that $\mathcal{V}B^{\dagger}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$;

g) the above linearization procedure allows us to find explicit expressions for the generating elements $\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-N}$ from Theorem 0.1.

There is the following non-formal aspect of our construction.

We could have started with the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L}/\mathcal{L}(p)$ and the image $\bar{e} = \bar{e}(t) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ of $e \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ to fix the projection $\eta_{\bar{e}} : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$ via methods of nilpotent Artin-Schreier theory. In order to define a deformation of $\eta_{\bar{e}}$ we choose auxiliary parameters $N^* = N^*(v_0) \equiv 0 \bmod N_0$ and $b^* \in \mathbb{Z}^+(p)$ such that $r^*(v_0) := b^*/(q-1)$ is "close" to v_0 (here $q = p^{N^*}$). If we apply σ^{N^*} to $\bar{e}$ we obtain $\sigma^{N^*}\bar{e} = \bar{e}(t^q)$ and $\eta_{\bar{e}}$ will be not changed. On the other hand, we can use a "deformation" of σ^{N^*} such that $t \mapsto t^q\widetilde{\exp}(t^{b^*})$. This operation gives us an element $\bar{e}' \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the nilpotent Artin-Schreier theory provides us with a new projection $\eta_{\bar{e}'} : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$. The initial expectation is that (after a careful choice of the parameters $N^* = N^*(v_0)$ and $r^* = r^*(v_0)$) the ramification ideal $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$ will appear as the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $\eta_{\bar{e}}$ coincides with its "deformation" $\eta_{\bar{e}'}$ modulo $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$. When following this idea we introduced a lift $\mathcal{V} : \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ and defined a deformation of σ^{N^*} as an automorphism of some subquotient of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{K}}$. An interesting aspect of this construction is that this deformation induces a group automorphism of the quotient $G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger})$ of $\mathcal{G}_{<p}$ which is not induced by an automorphism of $\mathcal{K}$. As a matter of fact, it comes in the form $\widetilde{\exp}(B^{\dagger})$ where $B^{\dagger}$ is a differentiation of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$ induced by a higher derivation $t^{aq} \mapsto at^{aq-b^*}$ (on the above subquotient of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{K}}$). Finally, we prove that the

ramification ideal $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$ is generated by the elements of $\mathcal{V}(B^{\dagger}(\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V}))$, or equivalently, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$ is the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that the deformation $B^{\dagger}$ descends to a trivial deformation of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}/\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)}$.

The methods from this paper admit a generalisation to the "modulo p^M" situation as well as to the case of higher dimensional local fields in the characteristic p case (in preparation). They also provide us with much better background for the paper [8] and its upcoming generalisations to the "modulo p^M" situation and the case of higher dimensional local fields in the mixed characteristic case.

1. Identification of nilpotent Artin-Schreier theory

Suppose $\mathcal{K}$ is a field of characteristic p, $\mathcal{K}_{sep}$ is a separable closure of $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \mathrm{Gal}(\mathcal{K}_{sep}/\mathcal{K})$. We assume that $\mathcal{G}$ acts on $\mathcal{K}_{sep}$ as follows: if $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ and $a \in \mathcal{K}_{sep}$ then $g_1(g_2a) = (g_1g_2)a$. Denote by σ the p-power morphism.

In [1, 2] we developed a nilpotent analogue of the classical Artin-Schreier theory of cyclic extensions of fields of characteristic p. We are going to use the covariant analogue of this theory, cf. the discussion in [7], for explicit description of the group $\mathcal{G}_{<p} = \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}^pC_p(\mathcal{G})$ as follows.

1.1. **Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$.** Suppose $\mathcal{K} = k((t))$ where t is a fixed uniformizer and $k \simeq \mathbb{F}_{p^{N_0}}$ with $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $\alpha_0 \in k$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}_{k/\mathbb{F}_p}(\alpha_0) = 1$.

Let $\mathbb{Z}^+(p) = \{a \in \mathbb{N} \mid (a,p) = 1\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^0(p) = \mathbb{Z}^+(p) \cup \{0\}$.

Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ be a profinite free Lie $\mathbb{F}_p$-algebra with the (topological) module of generators $\mathcal{K}^*/\mathcal{K}^{*p}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}/C_p(\widetilde{\mathcal{L}})$. Then we can take as a system of topological generators of $\mathcal{L}_k$ the set

$$\{D_0\} \cup \{D_{an} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}^+(p), n \in \mathbb{Z}/N_0\}$$

due to the following identifications:

$$(\mathcal{K}^*/\mathcal{K}^{*p})\hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{F}_p}k = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathcal{K}/(\sigma - \mathrm{id})\mathcal{K}, k) =$$

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\oplus_{a\in\mathbb{Z}^+(p)}kt^{-a} \oplus \mathbb{F}_p\alpha_0, k) = \prod_{a\in\mathbb{Z}^+(p)} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(kt^{-a}, k) \times kD_0$$

and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(kt^{-a}, k) = \prod_{n\in\mathbb{Z}/N_0} kD_{an}$, where for any $\alpha \in k$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+(p)$, $D_{an}(\alpha t^{-b}) = \delta_{ab}\sigma^n(\alpha)$. Note also that the first identification uses the Witt pairing [9, 6] and D_0 comes from $t \otimes 1 \in (\mathcal{K}^*/\mathcal{K}^{*p})\hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{F}_p}k$.

For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}/N_0$, set $D_{0n} = t \otimes (\sigma^n\alpha_0) = (\sigma^n\alpha_0)D_0$.

1.2. **Groups and Lie algebras of nilpotent class $< p$.** The basic ingredient of the nilpotent Artin-Schreier theory is the equivalence of the category of p-groups of nilpotent class $s_0 < p$ and the category of Lie $\mathbb{Z}_p$-algebras of the same nilpotent class s_0. In the case of objects killed by p, this equivalence can be explained as follows.

Let L be a Lie $\mathbb{F}_p$-algebra of nilpotent class $< p$, i.e. $C_p(L) = 0$.

Let A be the enveloping algebra of L. Then there is a natural embedding $L \subset A$, the elements of L generate the augmentation ideal J of A and we have a morphism of algebras $\Delta : A \longrightarrow A \otimes A$ uniquely determined by the condition $\Delta(l) = l \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes l$ for all $l \in L$ (in other words all $l \in L$ are primitive). Applying the Poincare-Birkhoff-Witt Theorem we obtain that:

— $L \cap J^p = 0$;

— $L \bmod J^p = \{a \bmod J^p \mid \Delta(a) \equiv a \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes a \bmod (J \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes J)^p\}$;

— the set $\widetilde{\exp}(L) \bmod J^p$ is identified with the set of all "diagonal elements modulo degree p", i.e. with the set of $a \in 1 + J \bmod J^p$ such that $\Delta(a) \equiv a \otimes a \bmod (J \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes J)^p$ (here $\widetilde{\exp}(x) = \sum_{0 \leqslant i < p} x^i/i!$ is the truncated exponential).

In particular, there is a natural embedding $L \subset A/J^p$ and in terms of this embedding the Campbell-Hausdorff formula appears as

$$(l_1, l_2) \mapsto l_1 \circ l_2 = l_1 + l_2 + \frac{1}{2}[l_1, l_2] + \ldots, \quad l_1, l_2 \in L\,,$$

where $\widetilde{\exp}(l_1)\widetilde{\exp}(l_2) \equiv \widetilde{\exp}(l_1 \circ l_2) \bmod J^p$. This composition law provides the set L with a group structure and we denote this group by $G(L)$. Note that I is an ideal in L iff $G(I)$ is a normal subgroup in $G(L)$. Clearly, $G(L)$ has period p and nilpotent class $< p$. Then the correspondence $L \mapsto G(L)$ is the above mentioned equivalence of the categories of p-groups of period p and nilpotent class $s < p$ and Lie $\mathbb{F}_p$-algebras of the same nilpotent class s. This equivalence can be naturally extended to the categories of pro-finite Lie algebras and pro-finite p-groups.

1.3. **Epimorphism $\eta_e^0 : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow G(\mathcal{L})$.** Let $L_{sep} := L_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}}$. Then the elements of $\mathcal{G} = \mathrm{Gal}(\mathcal{K}_{sep}/\mathcal{K})$ and σ act on L_{sep} through the second factor, $L_{sep}|_{\sigma=\mathrm{id}} = L$ and $(L_{sep})^{\mathcal{G}} = L_{\mathcal{K}}$. The covariant nilpotent Artin-Schreier theory states that for any $e \in G(L_{\mathcal{K}})$, the set

$$\mathcal{F}(e) = \{f \in G(L_{sep}) \mid \sigma(f) = e \circ f\}$$

is not empty and for any fixed $f \in \mathcal{F}(e)$, the map $\tau \mapsto (-f) \circ \tau(f)$ is a continuous group homomorphism $\pi_f(e) : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow G(L)$. The correspondence $e \mapsto \pi_f(e)$ has the following properties:

a) if $f' \in \mathcal{F}(e)$ then $f' = f \circ l$, where $l \in G(L)$, and $\pi_f(e)$ and $\pi_{f'}(e)$ are conjugated via l;

b) for any continuous group homomorphism $\pi : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow G(L)$, there are $e \in G(L_{\mathcal{K}})$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}(e)$ such that $\pi_f(e) = \pi$;

c) for appropriate elements $e, e' \in G(L_{\mathcal{K}})$ and $f, f' \in G(L_{sep})$, we have $\pi_f(e) = \pi_{f'}(e')$ iff there is an $x \in G(L_{\mathcal{K}})$ such that $f' = x \circ f$ and, therefore, $e' = \sigma(x) \circ e \circ (-x)$.

In [1, 2, 3] we applied this theory to the Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ from Subsection 1.1 via a special choice of $e \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ such that

$$\widetilde{\exp}\, e \equiv 1 + \sum_{1 \leqslant s < p} \eta(a_1, \dots, a_s) t^{-(a_1 + \dots + a_s)} D_{a_1 0} \dots D_{a_s 0} \bmod J^p_{\mathcal{L},\mathcal{K}} \,. \tag{1.1}$$

Here $J_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the augmentation ideal in the envelopping algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$ of $\mathcal{L}$. In the above sum the indices $a_1, \dots, a_s$ run over $\mathbb{Z}^0(p)$ and the "structural constants" $\eta(a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{F}_p$ satisfy the following identities:

$\mathrm{I_e}$) $\eta(a_1) = 1$;

II_e) if $0 \leqslant s_1 \leqslant s < p$ then

$$\eta(a_1, \dots, a_{s_1}) \eta(a_{s_1+1}, \dots, a_s) = \sum_{\pi \in I_{s_1 s}} \eta(a_{\pi(1)}, \dots, a_{\pi(s)}),$$

where $I_{s_1 s}$ consists of all permutations π of order s such that the sequences $\pi^{-1}(1), \dots, \pi^{-1}(s_1)$ and $\pi^{-1}(s_1 + 1), \dots, \pi^{-1}(s)$ are increasing (i.e. $I_{s_1 s}$ is the set of all "insertions" of the ordered set $\{1, \dots, s_1\}$ into the ordered set $\{s_1 + 1, \dots, s\}$).

Under the assumption $\mathrm{I_e}$) the map $\pi_f(e) \bmod \mathcal{G}^p C_2(\mathcal{G})$ induces a group isomorphism of $\mathcal{G}^{ab} \hat{\otimes} \mathbb{F}_p$ and $G(\mathcal{L})/C_2(G(\mathcal{L})) = \mathcal{L}^{ab} = \mathcal{K}^*/\mathcal{K}^{*p}$, which coincides with the inverse to the reciprocity map of local class field theory, cf. [6]. This also implies that $\eta^0_e := \pi_f(e)$ (when taken modulo $\mathcal{G}^p C_p(\mathcal{G})$) induces a group isomorphism $\eta_e : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \simeq G(\mathcal{L})$. In particular, we can work with the elements of $\mathcal{L}_k = "\mathcal{G}_{<p} \hat{\otimes} k"$ in terms of our explicit generators $\{D_{an} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}^+(p), n \in \mathbb{Z}/N_0\} \cup \{D_0\}$.

Assumption II_e) means that

$$\Delta(\widetilde{\exp}(e)) \equiv \widetilde{\exp}(e) \otimes \widetilde{\exp}(e) \bmod (J_{\mathcal{L},\mathcal{K}} \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} J_{\mathcal{L},\mathcal{K}})^p \,,$$

i.e. $\widetilde{\exp}(e)$ is diagonal modulo $J^p_{\mathcal{L},\mathcal{K}}$.

Under a fixed choice of the structural constants $\eta(a_1, \dots, a_s)$ the element e depends on the uniformiser $t \in \mathcal{K}$. We underline this fact in some cases by writing $e = e(t)$. Note that in most examples or interpretations of results from [1, 2, 3] we used the identification $\mathcal{G}_{<p} \simeq G(\mathcal{L})$ coming from the simplest choice $e = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p)} t^{-a} D_{a0}$ (in this case all $\eta(a_1, \dots, a_s) = 1/s!$). But as a matter of fact, all proofs in the papers [1, 2, 3] were adjusted to the above more general choice of e.

1.4. **Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ and epimorphism $\eta_{\bar{e}}$.** Introduce a weight function $\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{L}_k \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ on $\mathcal{L}_k$ by setting on its generators $\mathrm{wt}(D_{an}) = s$ if $(s-1)v_0 \leqslant a < sv_0$. Then we obtain a central decreasing filtration of ideals $\mathcal{L}(s) = \{l \in \mathcal{L} \mid \mathrm{wt}(l) \geqslant s\}$. This weight function gives us also a decreasing filtration of ideals $J_{\mathcal{L}}(s)$ in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $J_{\mathcal{L}}(1) = J_{\mathcal{L}}$ and for any s, $(J_{\mathcal{L}}(s) + J^p_{\mathcal{L}}) \cap \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(s)$ (use the Poincare-Birkhoff theorem).

Let $\bar{\mathcal{L}} := \mathcal{L}/\mathcal{L}(p)$ and consider the natural projection $\bar{\mathrm{pr}} : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}$. Then $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(s) = \bar{\mathrm{pr}}(\mathcal{L}(s))$ is a decreasing filtration in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(p) = 0$.

Consider an $\mathbb{F}_p$-submodule $\mathcal{N}$ in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ generated by all $t^{-b}l$ where $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s)_k$ and $b < sv_0$. Then $\mathcal{N}$ has a natural structure of a Lie algebra over $\mathbb{F}_p$. For any $i \geqslant 0$, let $\mathcal{N}(i)$ be the $\mathbb{F}_p$-submodule in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ generated by all $t^{-b}l$ where $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s)_k$ and $b < (s-i)v_0$. Then $\mathcal{N}(i)$ is an ideal in $\mathcal{N}$ and we can introduce the Lie $\mathbb{F}_p$-algebra $\bar{\mathcal{N}} = \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{N}(p)$. Note that $\mathcal{N}(p) \subset \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathrm{m}}$, where $\mathrm{m} = tk[[t]]$.

Lemma 1.1. $e_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} := \bar{\mathrm{pr}}_{\mathcal{K}} e \in \mathcal{N}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}}$ be an $\mathbb{F}_p$-submodule in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ generated by the elements of $\mathcal{L}(p)_{\mathcal{K}}$ and all $t^{-b}l$ such that $l \in \mathcal{L}(s)_k$, $b < sv_0$ and $1 \leqslant s < p$. It will be sufficient to prove that $e \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}}$ be an $\mathbb{F}_p$-submodule in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}$ generated by the elements of $J_{\mathcal{L}}(p)_{\mathcal{K}}$ and all $t^{-b}j$ such that $j \in J_{\mathcal{L}}(s)_k$ and $b < sv_0$. It will be sufficient to prove that $\widetilde{\exp} e \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}}$. Indeed, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}}$ is closed under multiplication and, therefore, $\widetilde{\log}(\widetilde{\exp} e) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}}$ (here $\widetilde{\log}$ is the truncated logarithm). It remains to notice that $e \equiv \widetilde{\log}(\widetilde{\exp} e) \bmod J_{\mathcal{K}}^p$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}} \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Verify that any term of the form $t^{-(a_1+\cdots+a_r)} D_{a_1 0} \dots D_{a_r 0}$ belongs to $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}}$. Indeed, if $\mathrm{wt}(D_{a_i 0}) = s_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, then $a_1 + \cdots + a_r < (s_1 + \dots s_r)v_0 = \mathrm{wt}(D_{a_1 0} \dots D_{a_r 0})v_0$. So, $\widetilde{\exp} e \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{L}}}$ and the lemma is proved. □

Let $\bar{e} := e_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} \bmod \mathcal{N}(p) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}$.

Let $\eta_{\bar{e}} := \bar{\mathrm{pr}} \cdot \eta_e : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$. Verify that $\eta_{\bar{e}}$ depends only on the image $\bar{e}$ of e in $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $e' \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $e'_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} := (\bar{\mathrm{pr}}_{\mathcal{K}}) e' \equiv e_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} \bmod \mathcal{N}(p)$. Then there is a unique $f' \in \mathcal{L}_{sep} \bmod \bar{\mathcal{L}}(p)_{sep}$ such that $\sigma f' = e' \circ f'$ and $\bar{\mathrm{pr}} \cdot \pi_{e'}(f') = \eta_{\bar{e}}$.*

Proof. Note that σ is topologically nilpotent on $\mathcal{N}(p) \bmod \mathcal{L}(p)_{\mathcal{K}}$. This implies the existence of a unique $x \in \mathcal{N}(p) \bmod \mathcal{L}(p)_{\mathcal{K}}$ such that $e'_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} = (\sigma x) \circ e_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} \circ (-x)$. Let $f_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} = (\bar{\mathrm{pr}}_{sep}) f \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{sep}$. Then $\sigma(x \circ f_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}}) = e'_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} \circ (x \circ f_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}})$. If $f' \in \mathcal{L}_{sep}$ is such that $\sigma f' = e' \circ f'$ and $f'_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} := \bar{\mathrm{pr}}_{sep} f'$ then for $g = (-f'_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}}) \circ x \circ f_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{sep}$ we have that $\sigma g \equiv g \bmod \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{sep}$. This implies that $g = l_0 \bmod \mathcal{L}(p)_{sep}$, where $l_0 \in \mathcal{L}$. Therefore, we can replace f' by $f' \circ l_0$ to satisfy the requirements of our proposition. From the above construction it is clear that f' is unique modulo $\mathcal{L}(p)_{sep}$. □

Remark. From now on we can use the construction of the morphism $\eta_{\bar{e}} : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$ in terms related only to the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$. Namely, there is a unique $\bar{f} \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_{sep} := \bar{\mathcal{N}} \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{K}_{sep}$ (which comes from our fixed $f \in \mathcal{L}_{sep}$) such that $\sigma \bar{f} = \bar{e} \circ \bar{f}$ and for any $\tau \in \mathcal{G}_{<p}$, $\eta_{\bar{e}}(\tau) = (-\bar{f}) \circ \tau(\bar{f}) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_{sep}|_{\sigma=\mathrm{id}} = \bar{\mathcal{L}}$.

2. Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}^\dagger$

In this Section we introduce a Lie $\mathbb{F}_p$-algebra $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ together with epimorphism of Lie algebras $\mathcal{V}:\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger\longrightarrow\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ and its section $j^0:\bar{\mathcal{L}}\longrightarrow\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$. Let $\alpha_p=\mathrm{Spec}\,\mathbb{F}_p[U]$, $U^p=0$, be the group scheme over $\mathbb{F}_p$ with the coaddition $\Delta(U)=U\otimes 1+1\otimes U$. We introduce the action $\Omega_U:\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger\longrightarrow\mathbb{F}_p[U]\otimes\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ of α_p on $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$.

2.1. **Special choice of parameters $r^*=r^*(v_0)$ and $N^*=N^*(v_0)$.** Denote by $\delta_0=\delta_0(v_0)$ the minimum of the positive values of

$$v_0-\frac{1}{s}(a_1+a_2/p^{n_2}+\dots+a_u/p^{n_u})\,,$$

where $1\leqslant s,u<p$, all $n_i\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $a_i\in[0,(p-1)v_0)\cap\mathbb{Z}^0(p)$. The existence of such $\delta_0>0$ can be proved easily by induction on u.

Let $r^*\in\mathbb{Q}$ be such that $r^*=b_0^*/(q_0^*-1)$, where $q_0^*=p^{N_0^*}$ with $N_0^*\geqslant 2$, $b_0^*\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\gcd(b_0^*,p(q_0^*-1))=1$. The set of such r^* is everywhere dense in $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ and we can fix $r^*=r^*(v_0)\in(v_0-\delta_0,v_0)$.

For $1\leqslant s<p$, introduce the following subsets in $\mathbb{Q}$:

— $A[s]$ is the set of all $a_1+a_2/p^{m_2}+\dots+a_u/p^{m_u}$, where $1\leqslant u\leqslant s$, all $m_i\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$, all $a_i\in[0,(p-1)v_0)\cap\mathbb{Z}^0(p)$ and $a_1\neq 0$ (in particular, $0\notin A[s]$). If $M\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ we denote by $A[s,M]$ the subset of $A[s]$ consisted of the elements satisfying the additional restrictions $m_2,\dots,m_u\leqslant M$. Note that $A[s,M]$ is finite.

— $B[s]$ is the set of all numbers $r^*(b_1+b_2/p^{m_2}+\dots+b_u/p^{m_u})$ where $1\leqslant u\leqslant s$, all $b_i\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $b_1+\dots+b_u<p$. For $M\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$, let $B[s,M]$ be the subset of $B[s]$ consisted of the elements satisfying the additional restrictions $m_2,\dots,m_u\leqslant M$. The set $B[s,M]$ is also finite.

Lemma 2.1. *For any s, $A[s]\cap B[s]=\emptyset$.*

Proof. Note that $A[s]\subset\mathbb{Z}[1/p]\setminus\{0\}$. Prove that $B[s]\cap\mathbb{Z}[1/p]=\{0\}$.

It will be sufficient to verify that for any $m_1,\dots,m_u\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ and $b_i\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that $0<b_1+\dots+b_u<p$, we have

$$b_1p^{m_1}+\dots+b_up^{m_u}\not\equiv 0\bmod(q_0^*-1)\,.$$

Since $q_0^*\equiv 1\bmod(q_0^*-1)$ we can assume that all $m_i<N_0^*$. But then $0<b_1p^{m_1}+\dots+b_up^{m_u}\leqslant(p-1)p^{N_0^*-1}<q_0^*-1$. The lemma is proved. □

For $\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{Q}$, set $\rho(\alpha,\beta)=|\alpha-\beta|$.

Lemma 2.2. *If $\alpha\notin B[s]$ then*

$$\rho(\alpha,B[s]):=\inf\{\rho(\alpha,\beta)\mid\beta\in B[s]\}\neq 0\,.$$

Proof. Use induction on s.

If $s=1$ there is nothing to prove because $B[1]$ is finite.

Suppose $s\leqslant p-2$ and $\rho(\alpha,B[s])>0$.

Choose $M_s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that $r^*(p-1)/p^{M_s} < \rho(\alpha, B[s])/2$.

If $\beta \in B[s+1] \setminus B[s+1, M_s]$ then there is $\beta' \in B[s]$ such that $\rho(\beta, \beta') < \rho(\alpha, B[s])/2$. Then

$$\rho(\alpha, \beta) \geqslant \rho(\alpha, \beta') - \rho(\beta', \beta) \geqslant \rho(\alpha, B[s]) - \rho(\alpha, B[s])/2 = \rho(\alpha, B[s])/2\,,$$

and we obtain

$$\rho(\alpha, B[s+1]) \geqslant \min\{\rho(\alpha, B[s+1, M_s]), \rho(\alpha, B[s])/2\} > 0\,.$$

The lemma is proved. □

Lemma 2.3. *If $\beta \notin A[s]$ then $\rho(\beta, A[s]) \neq 0$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of above Lemma 2.2. □

Lemma 2.4. *For all $1 \leqslant u, s < p$, $\rho(A[u], B[s]) > 0$.*

Proof. If $u = 1$ it follows from Lemma 2.2 because $A[1]$ is finite.

Suppose $u \leqslant p-2$ and $\rho(A[u], B[s]) = \delta_{us} > 0$.

Choose $M_u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ such that $(p-1)v_0/p^{M_u} < \delta_{us}/2$.

If $\alpha \in A[u+1] \setminus A[u+1, M_u]$ then there is $\alpha' \in A[u]$ such that $\rho(\alpha, \alpha') < \delta_{us}/2$. Then for any $\beta \in B[s]$, we have

$$\rho(\alpha, \beta) \geqslant \rho(\alpha', \beta) - \rho(\alpha, \alpha') > \delta_{us}/2\,.$$

Therefore, for any $\alpha \in A[s]$,

$$\rho(\alpha, B[s]) \geqslant \min\{\rho(A[u+1, M_u], B[s]), \delta_{us}/2\}\} > 0\,.$$

Lemma is proved. □

Specify the choice of $N^* = N^*(v_0) \in \mathbb{N}$ by the following conditions:

C1) $N^* \equiv 0 \bmod N_0^*$;

C2) $p^{N^*}\rho(A[p-1], B[p-1]) \geqslant 2r^*(p-1)$;

C3) $r^*(1 - p^{-N^*}) \in (v_0 - \delta_0, v_0)$.

Under this choice we set $q = p^{N^*}$ and $b^* = b_0^*(q-1)/(q_0-1) \in \mathbb{N}$ (note that $r^* = b^*/(q-1)$).

We need below the following property of such N^*.

Proposition 2.5. *If $\alpha \in A[p-1]$ and $\beta \in B[p-1]$ then*

$$q|q\alpha - (q-1)\beta| > b^*(p-1)\,.$$

Proof. Indeed,

$$q^2|\alpha - \beta + \beta/q| \geqslant q^2|\alpha - \beta| - \beta q \geqslant q^2\rho(A[p-1], B[p-1])$$

$$-r^*(p-1)q \geqslant 2r^*(p-1)q - r^*(p-1)q = r^*(p-1)q > b^*(p-1)\,.$$

□

2.2. **Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$.** Use the above $r^*=r^*(v_0)$ and $N^*=N^*(v_0)$.

Definition. $\mathfrak{A}=\mathfrak{A}(r^*,N^*)$ is the set of all $\iota=p^m(q\alpha-(q-1)\beta)$, where $m\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$, $\alpha\in A[p-1,m]$, $\beta\in B[p-1,m]$ and $|\iota|\leqslant b^*(p-1)$.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose $\iota=p^m(q\alpha-(q-1)\beta)\in\mathfrak{A}$. Then:*
a) $m<N^*$;
b) $p^m\alpha\in\mathbb{N}$ *and* $p^m\beta/r^*\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$ *do not depend on the presentation of* ι *in the form* $p^m(q\alpha-(q-1)\beta)$ *with* $\alpha\in A[p-1,m]$ *and* $\beta\in B[p-1,m]$.

Proof. If $m\geqslant N^*$ then by Proposition 2.5, $|\iota|>b^*(p-1)$ i.e. $\iota\notin\mathfrak{A}$. From the definition of the sets $A[p-1,m]$ and $B[p-1,m]$ it follows that $p^m\alpha,p^m\beta/r^*\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$. If $\iota=p^{m'}(q\alpha'-(q-1)\beta')$ is another presentation of ι then $p^m\beta/r^*$ and $p^{m'}\beta'/r^*$ are non-negative congruent modulo q integers and the both are smaller than q. Indeed, if $\beta/r^*=b_1+b_2p^{-m_2}+\cdots+b_up^{-m_u}$, where all $m_i\leqslant m$, then

$$p^m\beta/r^*\leqslant p^m(b_1+\cdots+b_u)\leqslant p^m(p-1)<p^{m+1}\leqslant q$$

because $m<N^*$. Similarly, $p^{m'}\beta'/r^*<q$. Therefore, they coincide and this implies also that $p^m\alpha=p^{m'}\alpha'$. □

Corollary 2.7. *If $\iota=p^m(q\alpha-(q-1)\beta)\in\mathfrak{A}$ then the sum of digits $b_1+\cdots+b_u$ of the appropriate $\beta/r^*=b_1+b_2p^{-m_2}+\cdots+b_up^{-m_u}$ depends only on ι.*

Definition. With the above notation set $\mathrm{ch}(\iota):=b_1+\cdots+b_u$.

Definition. a) $\mathfrak{A}^+(p)$ is the set of all $\iota=p^m(q\alpha-(q-1)\beta)\in\mathfrak{A}$ (given in the above standard notation) such that:
— $\iota>0$;
— $\gcd(p^m\alpha,p^m\beta/r^*)\not\equiv 0 \bmod p$;
— if $s\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\iota\in[(s-1)b^*,sb^*)$ then $\mathrm{ch}(\iota)\leqslant p-1-s$;

b) $\mathfrak{A}^0(p)=\mathfrak{A}^+(p)\cup\{0\}$;

c) $\mathfrak{A}^0_0(p)=\{\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)\mid\mathrm{ch}(\iota)=0\}=\{qa\mid a\in\mathbb{Z}^0(p)\cap[0,(p-1)v_0)\}$;

d) $\mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)=\{\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)\mid\mathrm{ch}(\iota)\geqslant 1\}$, $\mathfrak{A}^0_1(p)=\{\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)\mid\mathrm{ch}(\iota)=1\}$.

Proposition 2.8. *If v_p is the normalized p-adic valuation then all $\iota p^{-v_p(\iota)}$, where $\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^+(p)$, are pairwise different elements from $\mathbb{Z}^+(p)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\iota=p^m(q\alpha-(q-1)\beta)\in\mathfrak{A}^+(p)$.

If $\mathrm{ch}(\iota)=0$ then $\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0_0(p)$ and the correspondence $\iota\mapsto\iota p^{-v_p(\iota)}$ identifies $\mathfrak{A}^0_0(p)\setminus\{0\}\subset\mathfrak{A}^+(p)$ with $\mathbb{Z}^+(p)\cap[0,(p-1)v_0)$. Indeed, $qp^m\alpha<b^*(p-1)$ means that $a=p^m\alpha<r^*(p-1)$. According to property **C3** from Subsection 2.1 this condition and the condition $a<v_0(p-1)$ are equivalent because the both imply that $a\leqslant(v_0-\delta_0)(p-1)$.

If $\mathrm{ch}(\iota)\geqslant 1$ then $\iota p^{-m}\notin p\mathbb{N}$, i.e. $m\geqslant v_p(\iota)$. Indeed, $\iota p^{-m}=q\alpha-(q-1)\beta\in p\mathbb{N}$ implies (use that $m<N^*$) that $p^{-m}(b_1+b_2p^{m_2}+$

$\cdots + b_u p^{m_u}) \in p\mathbb{N}$ where all $m_i \in [0, m]$. But this number is $\leqslant \mathrm{ch}\,\iota < p$. The contradiction.

Then by Proposition 2.5, $\iota p^{-v_p(\iota)} \geqslant \iota p^{-m} = |q\alpha - (q-1)\beta| > (b^*/q)(p-1) = r^*(1-1/q)(p-1) > (v_0 - \delta_0)(p-1)$ (use property **C3** from Subsection 2.1). But we have mentioned already that if $a \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p) \cap [0, (p-1)v_0)$ then $v_0 - a/(p-1) > 0$ and from the definition of δ_0, cf. Subsection 1.4, it follows that $(v_0 - \delta_0)(p-1) \geqslant a$. It remains to note that for all $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)$, all $\iota p^{-v_p(\iota)}$ are different (use that $\gcd(p^m\alpha, p^m\beta/r^*) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$). The proposition is proved. □

Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger_k$ be the Lie algebra over k with the set of free generators

$$\{\ D^\dagger_{\iota n} \mid \iota \in \mathfrak{A}^+(p), n \in \mathbb{Z}/N_0\} \cup \{D^\dagger_0\}\,.$$

As earlier, set $D^\dagger_{0n} = \sigma^n(\alpha_0)D_0$, use the notation σ for the σ-linear k-automorphism of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger_k$ such that for all $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0(p)$, $D^\dagger_{\iota n} \mapsto D^\dagger_{\iota, n+1}$ and introduce the Lie $\mathbb{F}_p$-algebras $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger := \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger_k|_{\sigma=\mathrm{id}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^\dagger = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger/C_p(\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger)$.

For $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0(p)$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(s-1)b^* \leqslant \iota < sb^*$, set $\mathrm{wt}^\dagger(D^\dagger_{\iota n}) = s + \mathrm{ch}(\iota)$. From the definition of $\mathfrak{A}^0(p)$ it follows that the weights of all $D^\dagger_{\iota n}$ vary from 1 to $p-1$. Denote by $\{\mathcal{L}^\dagger(s)\}_{s\geqslant 1}$ the minimal central filtration of $\mathcal{L}^\dagger$ such that all $D^\dagger_{\iota n}$ with $\mathrm{wt}^\dagger(D^\dagger_{\iota n}) \geqslant s$ belong to $\mathcal{L}^\dagger(s)_k$.

Let $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger = \mathcal{L}^\dagger/\mathcal{L}^\dagger(p)$ and let $\bar{\mathrm{pr}}^\dagger : \mathcal{L}^\dagger \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ be the natural projection. Then $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ is provided with the induced decreasing filtration by the ideals $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s) = \bar{\mathrm{pr}}^\dagger(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s))$, $s \geqslant 1$, and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(p) = 0$.

The correspondences $D^\dagger_{\iota n} \mapsto D_{an}$, $\iota = qa \in \mathfrak{A}^0_0(p)$, and $D^\dagger_{\iota n} \mapsto 0$, $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)$, determine a unique morphism of Lie algebras $\mathcal{V} : \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}$.

Lemma 2.9. *For any $s \geqslant 1$, $\mathcal{V}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s)) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s)$.*

Proof. We must verify that for any $a \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p) \cap [0, (p-1)v_0)$ and $s \geqslant 1$, the conditions $qa \in [(s-1)b^*, sb^*)$ and $a \in [(s-1)v_0, sv_0)$ are equivalent. This follows easily from the definition of δ_0 (proceed similarly to the proof of Proposition 2.8). □

Let $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0}$ be the minimal Lie subalgebra of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0}_k$ contains all $D^\dagger_{\iota n}$ with $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0_0(p)$. Then $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0}$ has the induced filtration $\{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0}(s)\}_{s\geqslant 1}$ and $\mathcal{V}|_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0}} : \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ is isomorphism of filtered Lie algebras such that $D^\dagger_{qa,n} \mapsto D_{an}$. Set $j^0 := (\mathcal{V}|_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0}})^{-1} : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0}$.

Consider a unique presentation of $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger_{\mathcal{K}}$ in the form $l = \sum_{b \ll +\infty} t^{-b} l_b$ where all $l_b \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger_k$. Denote by $\mathcal{N}^\dagger$ the k-submodule of elements l such that for any b, there is $s_b \geqslant 1$ such that $l_b \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s_b)_k$ and $b < s_b b^*$. Then $\mathcal{N}^\dagger$ is an $\mathbb{F}_p$-Lie subalgebra in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger_{\mathcal{K}}$ and for $i \geqslant 0$, $\mathcal{N}^\dagger(i) := t^{ib^*}\mathcal{N}^\dagger$ are ideals in $\mathcal{N}^\dagger$. Set $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger = \mathcal{N}^\dagger/\mathcal{N}^\dagger(p)$.

Similarly to Subsection 1.4, we can apply the constructions of nilpotent Artin-Schreier theory to the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger$. More precisely, let $\mathcal{N}^\dagger_{sep}$ be a subgroup in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger_{sep}$ generated by all γl, where for some $s \geqslant 1$, $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s)$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}_{sep}$ and $-v_t(\gamma) < sb^*$ (here v_t is the valuation on

$\mathcal{K}_{sep}$ such that $v_t(t)=1$). Define the ideals $\mathcal{N}^{\dagger}_{sep}(i)=t^{ib^*}\mathcal{N}^{\dagger}_{sep}$ and set $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}_{sep}=\mathcal{N}^{\dagger}_{sep}/\mathcal{N}^{\dagger}_{sep}(p)$. If $\bar{e}^{\dagger}\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}$ then

$$\mathcal{M}^{\dagger}:=\{\bar{f}^{\dagger}\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}_{sep}\mid \sigma\bar{f}^{\dagger}=\bar{e}^{\dagger}\circ\bar{f}^{\dagger}\}\neq\emptyset$$

and all elements of $\mathcal{M}^{\dagger}$ can be obtained one from another by shifts $\bar{f}^{\dagger}\mapsto\bar{f}^{\dagger}\circ l$, where $l\in G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger})$. Fix $\bar{f}^{\dagger}\in\mathcal{M}^{\dagger}$ and introduce a homomorphism $\pi_{\bar{f}^{\dagger}}(\bar{e}^{\dagger}):\mathcal{G}_{<p}\longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger})$ such that $\tau\mapsto(-\bar{f}^{\dagger})\circ\tau(\bar{f}^{\dagger})\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}_{sep}|_{\sigma=\mathrm{id}}=\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}$.

Suppose $\bar{e}^{\dagger}=\bar{e}^{\dagger 0}+\bar{e}^{\dagger 1}\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}$ is such that:

a_1) $\bar{e}^{\dagger 0}=(j^0\otimes\sigma^{N^*})\bar{e}$, where $\bar{e}\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}$ was defined in Subsection 1.4;

a_2) $\bar{e}^{\dagger}_1\in\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{K}}$ where we use the same notation $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{K}}$ for the map $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}\longrightarrow\bar{\mathcal{N}}$ induced by $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{K}}:\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{K}}\longrightarrow\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}$;

a_3) $\bar{e}^{\dagger}_1-\sum_{\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)}t^{-\iota}D^{\dagger}_{\iota 0}$ is a k-linear combination of the elements of the form $t^{-(\iota_1+\dots+\iota_r)}[\dots[D^{\dagger}_{\iota_1 0},D^{\dagger}_{\iota_2 0}],\dots,D^{\dagger}_{\iota_r 0}]\in\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{K}}$ with $r\geqslant 2$.

Properties a_1) and a_2) mean that we can choose $\bar{f}^{\dagger}$ such that the morphism $\eta_{\bar{e}^{\dagger}}:=\pi_{\bar{f}^{\dagger}}(\bar{e}^{\dagger}):\mathcal{G}_{<p}\longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger})$ is compatible with $\eta_{\bar{e}}$ via $\mathcal{V}:\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}\longrightarrow\bar{\mathcal{L}}$, i.e. $\mathcal{V}\eta_{\bar{e}^{\dagger}}=\eta_{\bar{e}}$. Property a_3) means that $\eta_{\bar{e}^{\dagger}}$ is surjective.

2.3. **The action Ω_U.** Let $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$ be a closed $\mathbb{F}_p$-submodule in $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}$ generated by the elements $w=t^{-\iota}l$ such that for some s, we have $l\in\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}(s)_k$, $\iota\in\mathfrak{A}\cup\{0\}$ and $\iota+\mathrm{ch}(\iota)b^*<sb^*$. E.g. for any $\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)$, $t^{-\iota}D^{\dagger}_{\iota n}\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$ because $\iota+\mathrm{ch}(\iota)b^*<\mathrm{wt}^{\dagger}(D^{\dagger}_{\iota n})b^*=sb^*$.

Lemma 2.10. a) *$\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$ is a Lie subalgebra of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}$.*

b) *For any $j\geqslant 0$, $t^{jb^*}\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$ is an ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$.*

Proof. a) Suppose $w_1=t^{-\iota_1}l_1$ and $w_2=t^{-\iota_2}l_2$ belong to $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$. We can assume that there are $s_1,s_2\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $l_1\in\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}(s_1)_k$, $l_2\in\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}(s_2)_k$, $\iota_1+\mathrm{ch}(\iota_1)b^*<s_1b^*$ and $\iota_2+\mathrm{ch}(\iota_2)b^*<s_2b^*$. Verify that $w=[w_1,w_2]\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$. Indeed, we can assume that $s=s_1+s_2<p$, because, otherwise, $\mathrm{wt}^{\dagger}([l_1,l_2])\geqslant s\geqslant p$ and $[l_1,l_2]=0$. If $\mathrm{ch}\iota_1+\mathrm{ch}\iota_2\geqslant p$ then $w=0$ because, $-(\iota_1+\iota_2)b^*>-sb^*+pb^*$ and $t^{pb^*}\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger}=0$. Otherwise, $\iota=\iota_1+\iota_2\in\mathfrak{A}\cup\{0\}$, $\iota+\mathrm{ch}(\iota)b^*<sb^*$ and $w\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$.

b) It will be sufficient to verify that $t^{jb^*}w\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$, where $w=t^{-\iota}l$ with $l\in\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}(s)_k$ and $\iota+\mathrm{ch}(\iota)b^*<sb^*$. If $\mathrm{ch}(\iota)+j<p$ then $t^{jb^*}w=t^{-\iota'}l$ with $\iota'=\iota-jb^*\in\mathfrak{A}$ and $\iota'+\mathrm{ch}(\iota')b^*=\iota-jb^*+(\mathrm{ch}(\iota)+j)b^*<sb^*$. If $\mathrm{ch}(\iota)+j\geqslant p$ then (as earlier) $t^{jb^*}w=0$. □

If $\gamma\in\mathbb{Z}/p$, $\iota=p^n(q\alpha-(q-1)\beta)\in\mathfrak{A}\cup\{0\}$ and $t^{-\iota}l\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$, where $l\in\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger}(s)_k$ then by the above lemma

$$\Omega_{\gamma}(t^{-\iota}l):=t^{-\iota}\widetilde{\exp}(\gamma(p^n\alpha)t^{b^*})l\ \in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}.$$

Suppose $w \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$. Then $w = \sum_{\iota \in \mathfrak{A} \cup \{0\}} t^{-\iota} l_\iota$, where all $t^{-\iota} l_\iota \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$. Set

$$\Omega_\gamma(w) = \sum_{\iota \in \mathfrak{A} \cup \{0\}} \Omega_\gamma(t^{-\iota} l_\iota).$$

Clearly, $\Omega_\gamma(w) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$, and we obtained a well-defined action $w \mapsto \Omega_\gamma(w)$ of $\mathbb{Z}/p$ on the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$.

For the free generators $D_{\iota n}$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_k^\dagger$ set $\mathrm{ch}(D_{\iota n}^\dagger) := \mathrm{ch}(\iota)$. By setting $\mathrm{ch}(D_{\iota_1 n_1}^\dagger \dots D_{\iota_r n_r}^\dagger) = \mathrm{ch}(\iota_1) + \dots + \mathrm{ch}(\iota_r)$ we obtain the grading $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^\dagger = \oplus_{j \geqslant 0} \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^\dagger[j]$ of the envelopping algebra $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^\dagger$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$. As a result, we obtain the induced grading in the category of Lie algebras $\mathcal{L}^\dagger = \oplus_{j \geqslant 0} \mathcal{L}^\dagger[j]$. Here $\mathcal{L}^\dagger[j]_k$ is generated as k-module by all commutators $[\dots[D_{\iota_1 n_1}, D_{\iota_2 n_2}], \dots, D_{\iota_r n_r}]$ such that $\mathrm{ch}(\iota_1) + \dots + \mathrm{ch}(\iota_r) = j$.

We have also $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s) = \oplus_{j \geqslant 0} \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s)[j]$, where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s)[j] := \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s) \cap \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[j])$ and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s)[s] = 0$. Similarly, $\mathcal{N}^\dagger = \oplus_{j \geqslant 0} \mathcal{N}^\dagger[j]$, $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger = \oplus_{j \geqslant 0} \bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger[j]$ and $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp} = \oplus_{j \geqslant 0} \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}[j]$, where $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}[p-1] = 0$.

Note that any element of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}[j]$ appears a sum of elements of the form $t^{-\iota} l$, where in addition to earlier conditions $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s)_k$ and $\iota + \mathrm{ch}(\iota) b^* < s b^*$ we should add $\mathrm{ch}(l) = j$.

For $i \geqslant 0$, let $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$ be the closure of the subgroup in $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$ generated by all $t^{-\iota} l_\iota \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}[j]$, $j \geqslant 0$, such that $\mathrm{ch}(\iota) \geqslant j + i$. Then:

— $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(0)$ is a Lie algebra;

— $\{\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)\}_{i \geqslant 0}$ is a decreasing filtration by ideals of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(0)$, i.e. for any $i_1, i_2 \geqslant 0$, $[\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i_1), \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i_2)] \subset \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i_1 + i_2)$;

— $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(p) = 0$.

Proposition 2.11. *For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}/p$, there are unique $\bar{c}_\gamma \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(1)$ and $A_\gamma^\dagger \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{Lie}} \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ such that*

a) $\Omega_\gamma \bar{e}^\dagger = (\sigma \bar{c}_\gamma) \circ (A_\gamma^\dagger \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}}) \bar{e}^\dagger \circ (-\bar{c}_\gamma)$;

b) *for any $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0(p)$, $\mathrm{ch}(A_\gamma^\dagger(D_{\iota 0}^\dagger) - D_{\iota 0}^\dagger) < \mathrm{ch}(\iota)$.*

Proof. First, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.12. *Suppose that $i \geqslant 1$ and $n \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$. Then there are unique $\mathcal{S}(n), \mathcal{R}(n) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$ such that*

a) $\mathcal{R}(n) = \sum_{\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^+_{\geqslant 1}(p)} t^{-\iota} l_\iota$ *with all $l_\iota \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_k^\dagger$;*

b) $n = \mathcal{R}(n) + (\sigma - \mathrm{id}) \mathcal{S}(n)$.

Proof of lemma. Introduce additive operators $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S} : \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i) \longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$.

Recall that any $n \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$ appears as a sum of the elements of the form $t^{-\iota} l$, where for some $j \geqslant 0$, $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[j]_k$, $\iota + \mathrm{ch}(\iota) b^* < \mathrm{wt}^\dagger(l) b^*$.

• Let $\iota < 0$. Set $\mathcal{R}(t^{-\iota} l) = 0$ and $\mathcal{S}(t^{-\iota} l) = -\sum_{m \geqslant 0} t^{-\iota p^m} \sigma^m l$.

— If $-\iota p^m > b^*(p-1)$ then $t^{-\iota p^m} \sigma^m l \in t^{b^*(p-1)} \bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger = 0$.

— If $-\iota p^m < b^*(p-1)$ then:

a) $\iota p^m + \mathrm{ch}(\iota p^m)b^* \leqslant \iota + \mathrm{ch}(\iota)b^* < \mathrm{wt}^\dagger(l)b^* = \mathrm{wt}^\dagger(\sigma^m l)b^*$;

b) $j = \mathrm{ch}(l) = \mathrm{ch}(\sigma^m l)$ and $\mathrm{ch}(\iota p^m) = \mathrm{ch}(\iota) \geqslant j + i$.

Therefore, both $\mathcal{R}(n)$ and $\mathcal{S}(n)$ belong to $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$.

• Let $\iota > 0$. Suppose $\iota = p^{m(\iota)}\iota_1$ where $\iota_1 \in \mathfrak{A}^+(p)$. Then $m(\iota) \geqslant 0$ and we set $\mathcal{R}(n) = t^{-\iota_1}\sigma^{-m(\iota)}l$ and $\mathcal{S}(n) = \sum_{0\leqslant m<m(\iota)} \sigma^m(\mathcal{R}(n))$.

Verify that if $0 \leqslant m \leqslant m(\iota)$ then $\sigma^m\mathcal{R}(n) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$. Indeed:

a) $\iota_1 p^m + \mathrm{ch}(\iota_1 p^m)b^* \leqslant \iota + \mathrm{ch}(\iota) < \mathrm{wt}^\dagger(l)b^* = \mathrm{wt}^\dagger(\sigma^{-m(\iota)+m}l)b^*$;

b) $\mathrm{ch}(\iota_1 p^m) = \mathrm{ch}(\iota) \geqslant \mathrm{ch}(l) + i = \mathrm{ch}(\sigma^{-m(\iota)+m}l) + i$.

So, we proved the existence of $\mathcal{R}(n)$ and $\mathcal{S}(n)$ (note that $0 \notin \mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)$). The uniqueness follows from the fact that for $i \geqslant 1$, $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)|_{\sigma=\mathrm{id}} = 0$ (again, $0 \notin \mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)$). The lemma is proved. □

Continue the proof of Proposition 2.11.

Use induction on $i \geqslant 1$ to prove the proposition modulo $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$.

If $i = 1$ take $\bar{c}_\gamma = 0$ and $A^\dagger_\gamma = \mathrm{id}$ (use that $\Omega_\gamma(\bar{e}^\dagger) - \bar{e}^\dagger \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(1)$).

Assume $1 \leqslant i < p$ and for $\bar{c}_\gamma \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(1)$ and $A^\dagger_\gamma \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{Lie}}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger)$,

$$H = \Omega_\gamma\bar{e}^\dagger - (\sigma\bar{c}_\gamma) \circ (A^\dagger_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}})\bar{e}^\dagger \circ (-\bar{c}_\gamma) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)\,.$$

Then $\mathcal{R}(H), \mathcal{S}(H) \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$ and $\mathcal{R}(H) = \sum_{\mathrm{ch}(\iota)\geqslant i+j} t^{-\iota}H_{\iota,j}$, where all $H_{\iota j} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[j]_k$. Introduce $A^{\dagger\prime}_\gamma \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{Lie}}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger)$ by setting for all ι and j, $A^{\dagger\prime}_\gamma(D^\dagger_{\iota 0}) = A^\dagger_\gamma(D^\dagger_{\iota 0}) - \sum_j H_{\iota j}$ amd set $\bar{c}'_\gamma = \bar{c}_\gamma - \mathcal{S}(H)$. Then

$$\Omega_\gamma\bar{e}^\dagger \equiv (\sigma\bar{c}'_{\gamma 1}) \circ (A^{\dagger\prime}_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}})\bar{e}^\dagger \circ (-\bar{c}'_\gamma)\mathrm{mod}\,\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i+1)\,.$$

Proposition is proved. □

We have obviously the following properties.

Corollary 2.13. *For any $\gamma, \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{Z}/p$,*

a) $A^\dagger_{\gamma+\gamma_1} = A^\dagger_\gamma A^\dagger_{\gamma_1}$;

b) $\Omega_\gamma(\bar{c}_{\gamma_1}) \circ (A^\dagger_{\gamma_1} \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}})\bar{c}_\gamma = \bar{c}_{\gamma+\gamma_1}$;

c) *if $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[j]$ then $A^\dagger_\gamma(l) - l \in \oplus_{j'<j}\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[j']$, in particular, $A^\dagger_\gamma|_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{\dagger 0}} = \mathrm{id}$.*

Let $A^\dagger := A^\dagger_\gamma|_{\gamma=1}$. Then for any $\gamma = n\,\mathrm{mod}p$, $A^\dagger_\gamma = A^{\dagger n}$, in particular, $A^{\dagger p} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{L}^\dagger}$. By part c) of the above corolalry, for all $i \geqslant 0$,

$$(A^\dagger_\gamma - \mathrm{id}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger})\left(\oplus_{j\leqslant i}\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[j]\right) \subset \oplus_{j\leqslant i-1}\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[j]\,.$$

Therefore, there is a differentiation $B^\dagger \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{Lie}}\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ such that for all $i \geqslant 0$, $B^\dagger(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[i]) \subset \oplus_{j<i}\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger[j]$ and $A^\dagger_\gamma = \widetilde{\exp}(\gamma B^\dagger)$.

Let $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}\{\bar{f}^\dagger\}$ be the minimal Lie subalgebra in $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger_{sep}$ generated by $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$ and all $(A^\dagger_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id})\bar{f}^\dagger$. Then the map

$$\bar{f}^\dagger \mapsto \Omega_\gamma\bar{f}^\dagger := \bar{c}_\gamma \circ (A^\dagger_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id})\bar{f}^\dagger \tag{2.1}$$

extends the action of $\mathbb{Z}/p$ to the algebra $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}\{\bar{f}^\dagger\}$. As a result, we obtain the group homomorphisms $\Omega_\gamma\eta_{\bar{e}^\dagger}:\mathcal{G}_{<p}\longrightarrow G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger)$ such that for any $\tau\in\mathcal{G}$,

$$\Omega_\gamma\eta_{\bar{e}^\dagger}(\tau)=(-\Omega_\gamma\bar{f}^\dagger)\circ(\tau\Omega_\gamma\bar{f}^\dagger)\in G(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger)\,.$$

In particular, the element $\gamma\in\mathbb{Z}/p$ acts on $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ via the operator $A^\dagger_\gamma$ and this action is compatible with the action $\eta_{\bar{e}^\dagger}\mapsto\Omega_\gamma\eta_{\bar{e}^\dagger}$. Indeed, $\Omega_\gamma\eta_{\bar{e}^\dagger}$ sends any $\tau\in\mathcal{G}$ to

$$(-\Omega_\gamma\bar{f}^\dagger)\circ(\tau\Omega_\gamma\bar{f}^\dagger)=(A^\dagger_\gamma\otimes\mathrm{id})((-\bar{f}^\dagger)\circ\tau(\bar{f}^\dagger))=A^\dagger_\gamma(\eta_{\bar{e}^\dagger}(\tau))\,.$$

Applying the methods from [5], Section 3, we obtain the existence of $\bar{c}^i\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(i)$ with $1\leqslant i<p$, such that:

if $\bar{c}_U=\bar{c}^1U+\dots+\bar{c}^{p-1}U^{p-1}\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger\otimes\mathbb{F}_p[U]$, *where* $U^p=0$, *then for all* $\gamma\in\mathbb{Z}/p$, $\bar{c}_U|_{U=\gamma}=\bar{c}_\gamma$.

As a result, we obtain the action Ω_U of the formal group scheme $\alpha_p=\mathrm{Spec}\mathbb{F}_p[U]$ with $U^p=0$ and the coaddition $U\mapsto U\otimes 1+1\otimes U$, on the Lie algebras $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}\{\bar{f}^\dagger\}$.

In particular, $\Omega_U(\bar{f}^\dagger)=\bar{c}_U\circ(A^\dagger_U\otimes\mathrm{id})\bar{f}^\dagger$, where $A^\dagger_U|_{U=\gamma}=A^\dagger_\gamma$ and

$$\Omega_U(\bar{e}^\dagger)=\sigma(\bar{c}_U)\circ(A^\dagger_U\otimes\mathrm{id})\bar{e}^\dagger\circ(-\bar{c}_U)\,. \tag{2.2}$$

This formalism allows us to recover uniquely the action Ω_U from its differential $d\Omega_U:=\Omega^1U$, where $\Omega_U=\sum_{0\leqslant i<p}\Omega^iU^i$ (here $\Omega^0=\mathrm{id}$). Similarly, the cocycle $\bar{c}_U$ is determined uniquely by its linear part $\bar{c}^1$.

3. Ideal $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$

Define the ideal $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ as the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $\mathcal{V}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]})$ is invariant with respect to the above defined action of $\mathbb{Z}/p$ or, equivalently, the action Ω_U of the group scheme α_p. This implies that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ is the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}_k$ contains all the elements $\mathcal{V}B^\dagger(D^\dagger_{\iota 0})$, where $\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)$ (note that if $\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0_0(p)$ then $B^\dagger(D^\dagger_{\iota 0})=0$). Notice also that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ appears as the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that Ω_U descends to the trivial action on $\bar{\mathcal{L}}/\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$.

3.1. **A recurrent relation.** Below we carry out the computations in the enveloping algebras $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$ and $\mathcal{A}$ of the Lie algebras $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ and, resp., $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ modulo the p-th power of their augmentation ideals $\mathcal{J}^\dagger$ and $\mathcal{J}$. Note that the enveloping algebra of $\mathcal{N}\subset\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ can be identified with an $\mathbb{F}_p$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}$. This implies that the enveloping algebra of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}=\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{N}(p)$ can be considered as a subalgebra in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}\bmod\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{N}(p))$, where $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{N}(p))$ is the ideal generated by the elements of $\mathcal{N}(p)$. Similarly, we can treat the elements of the enveloping algebra of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger$ as the elements of $\mathcal{A}^\dagger_{\mathcal{K}}$ taken modulo the analogous ideal $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{N}^\dagger(p))$.

With the above agreement set

$$\widetilde{\exp}\,\Omega_U(\bar{e}^\dagger)=\widetilde{\exp}\,\bar{e}^\dagger+\mathcal{E}^1U\bmod\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{N}^\dagger(p))+\mathcal{A}^\dagger_{\mathcal{K}}U^2+\mathcal{J}^{\dagger p}_{\mathcal{K}}U\,.$$

Set $\mathcal{E}^1_0 := \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{E}^1)$ and note that modulo $\mathcal{J}^p_{\mathcal{K}}$ we have:

$$\mathcal{E}^1_0 \equiv \sum_{\substack{s\geqslant 1\\ a_i\in\mathbb{Z}^0(p)}} \eta(a_1,\dots,a_s)t^{-(a_1+\dots+a_s)q+b^*}(a_1+\dots+a_s)D_{a_10}\dots D_{a_s0}\,.$$

Remark. Recall that we use the same notation D_{an} for the images of generators D_{an} of $\mathcal{L}_k$ in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k$. In particular, when working in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ or $\mathcal{N}$ it holds $D_{an}=0$ if $a\geqslant (p-1)v_0$.

Use (2.2) and set $\bar{c}^1_0=\mathcal{V}(\bar{c}^1)\in\mathcal{V}(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\dagger sp}(1))\subset\sigma^{N^*}\bar{\mathcal{N}}(1)$ to obtain the following congruence modulo $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{N}(p))+\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}U^2+\mathcal{J}^p_{\mathcal{K}}U$:

$$(1-(\sigma\bar{c}^1_0)U)(\widetilde{\exp}\bar{e}^{(q)}+\mathcal{E}^1_0U)(1+\bar{c}^1_0U)\equiv\bar{e}^{(q)}+(\mathcal{V}B^\dagger\otimes\mathrm{id})\bar{e}^\dagger U.$$

Comparing the coefficients for U we obtain that

$$\sigma(\bar{c}^1_0)-\bar{c}^1_0+(\mathcal{V}B^\dagger\otimes\mathrm{id})\bar{e}^\dagger\equiv$$

$$\mathcal{E}^1_0+(\widetilde{\exp}\,\bar{e}^{(q)}-1)\bar{c}^1_0-\sigma(\bar{c}^1_0)(\widetilde{\exp}\,\bar{e}^{(q)}-1) \tag{3.1}$$
$$\mathrm{mod}\,\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{N}(p))+\mathcal{J}^p_{\mathcal{K}}\,.$$

This congruence determines uniquely the elements $\mathcal{V}B^\dagger(D^\dagger_{\iota 0})\in\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k$, where $\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)$. Then the ideal $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ appears as the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that its extension of scalars $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}_k$ contains all $\mathcal{V}B^\dagger(D^\dagger_{\iota 0})$ with $\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)$. If we replace these elements by elements $V_{\iota 0}\in\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k$ such that $V_{\iota 0}\equiv\mathcal{V}B^\dagger(D^\dagger_{\iota 0})\,\mathrm{mod}\,[\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]},\bar{\mathcal{L}}]_k$ then these new elements $V_{\iota 0}$ also can be used for the similar characterization of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$. The elements $V_{\iota 0}$ can be found from the modified version of (3.1), where $(\mathcal{V}B^\dagger\otimes\mathrm{id})\bar{e}^\dagger$ is replaced by $\sum_{\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)}t^{-\iota}V_{\iota 0}$ (use property $\mathbf{a_3}$) from Subsection 2.2). This modified congruence can be considered in the enveloping algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{K}}$ of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{K}}$ in the following form:

$$\sigma(c^1_0)-c^1_0+\sum_{\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)}t^{-\iota}V_{\iota 0}\equiv$$

$$\mathcal{E}^1_0+(\widetilde{\exp}\,e^{(q)}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}}-1)c^1_0-\sigma(c^1_0)(\widetilde{\exp}\,e^{(q)}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}}-1)\,\mathrm{mod}\,\mathcal{J}^p_{\mathcal{K}}\,. \tag{3.2}$$

Indeed, if $\bar{c}^1_0\in\bar{\mathcal{N}}(1)$ satisfies the above mentioned modified version of (3.1) then there is a unique $c^1_0\in\mathcal{N}(1)$ such that $\bar{c}^1_0=c^1_0\,\mathrm{mod}\,\mathcal{N}(p)$ and congruence (3.2) holds modulo $\mathcal{J}^p_{\mathcal{K}}$ (use that σ is topologically nilpotent on $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{N}(p))$).

As a result, the ideal $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ appears now as the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}_k$ contains the elements $V_{\iota 0}\in\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k$ satisfying the following system of congruences modulo $\mathcal{J}^p_{\mathcal{K}}$:

$$\sigma(c^1_0)-c^1_0+\sum_{\iota\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)}t^{-\iota}V_{\iota 0}\equiv \tag{3.3}$$

$$\sum_{s,a_i} \eta(a_1,\dots,a_s) t^{-(a_1+\dots+a_s)q+b^*}(a_1+\dots+a_s) D_{a_10}\dots D_{a_s0}$$
$$+\left(\sum_{s,a_i} \eta(a_1,\dots,a_s) t^{-(a_1+\dots+a_s)q} D_{a_10}\dots D_{a_s0}\right) c_0^1$$
$$-\sigma(c_0^1)\left(\sum_{s,a_i} \eta(a_1,\dots,a_s) t^{-(a_1+\dots+a_s)q} D_{a_10}\dots D_{a_s0}\right).$$

(In above sums the indices run over $s \geqslant 1$ and $a_1,\dots,a_s \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p)$.)

3.2. **Structural constants.** For $\bar a = (a_1,\dots,a_s)$ with all $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p)$, set $\eta(\bar a) = \eta(a_1,\dots,a_s)$, where η was defined in Subsection 1.3.

Definition. Let $\bar n = (n_1,\dots,n_s)$ with $s \geqslant 1$. Suppose there is a partition $0 = i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_r = s$ such that if $u \in (i_j, i_{j+1}]$ then $n_u = m_{j+1}$ and $m_1 > m_2 > \dots > m_r$. Then set

$$\eta(\bar a, \bar n)_s = \sigma^{m_1}\eta(\bar a^{(1)})\dots\sigma^{m_r}\eta(\bar a^{(r)}),$$

where $\bar a^{(j)} = (a_{i_{j-1}+1},\dots,a_{i_j})$. If such a partition does not exist we set $\eta(\bar a,\bar n)_s = 0$. (If there is no risk of confusion we just wright $\eta(\bar a,\bar n)$.)

If $s = 0$ we set $\eta(\bar a,\bar n)_s = 1$.

For $\bar a = (a_1,\dots,a_s)$, $\bar n = (n_1,\dots,n_s)$, set $D_{(\bar a,\bar n)} = D_{a_1n_1}\dots D_{a_sn_s}$.

Clearly, if $e_{(N^*,0]} := \sigma^{N^*-1}e\circ\sigma^{N^*-2}e\circ\dots\sigma e\circ e$ then

$$\widetilde{\exp}\, e_{(N^*,0]} = \sum_{\bar a,\bar n} \eta(\bar a,\bar n)_s D_{(\bar a,\bar n)}.$$

Let $-e_{[0,N^*)} := (-e)\circ(-\sigma e)\dots(-\sigma^{N^*-1}e)$ and introduce similar constants $\eta^o(\bar a,\bar n) \in k$ by the following equality

$$\widetilde{\exp}(-e_{[0,N^*)}) = \sum \eta^o(\bar a,\bar n) D_{(\bar a,\bar n)}.$$

Set $\eta^0(\bar a) := \eta^o(\bar a,\bar 0)$.

It can be easily seen that if there is a partition from the above definition of η-constants but such that $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_r$ then

$$\eta^o(\bar a,\bar n)_s = \sigma^{m_1}\eta^o(\bar a^{(1)})\sigma^{m_2}\eta^o(\bar a^{(2)})\dots\sigma^{m_r}\eta^o(\bar a^{(r)}).$$

Otherwise, $\eta^o(\bar a,\bar n)_s = 0$.

In some cases we write $\eta(1,\dots,s)$ instead of $\eta(\bar a,\bar n)_s$ and use the similar agreement for η^o. E.g. the equalities

$$e_{(N^*,0]}\circ(-e_{[0,N^*)}) = e_{[0,N^*)}\circ(-e_{(N^*,0]}) = 0$$

mean that

$$\sum_{0\leqslant s_1\leqslant s} \eta(1,\dots,s_1)\eta^o(s_1+1,\dots,s) = \sum_{0\leqslant s_1\leqslant s} \eta^o(1,\dots,s_1)\eta(s_1+1,\dots,s) = \delta_{0s} \tag{3.4}$$

(here δ_{0s} is the Kronecker symbol).

For $1 \leqslant s_1 \leqslant s < p$, consider the subset Φ_{ss_1} of substitutions π of order s such that $\pi(1) = s_1$ and for any $1 \leqslant l \leqslant s$, the subset $\{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(l)\}$ of the segment $[1, s]$ is "connected", i.e. there exists $n(l) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(l)\} = \{n(l), n(l)+1, \dots, n(l)+l-1\}.$$

By definition, we set $\Phi_{s0} = \Phi_{s,s+1} = \emptyset$.

Set $B_{s_1}(1, \dots, s) = \sum_{\pi \in \Phi_{ss_1}} \eta(\pi(1), \dots, \pi(s))$. Note that

— $B_0(1, \dots, s) = B_{s+1}(1, \dots, s) = 0$;

— $B_1(1, \dots, s) = \eta(1, 2, \dots, s)$;

— $B_s(1, \dots, s) = \eta(s, s-1, \dots, 1)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that $0 \leqslant s_1 \leqslant s < p$. Then:*

a) $B_{s_1}(1, \dots, s) + B_{s_1+1}(1, \dots, s) = \eta(s_1, \dots, 1)\eta(s_1+1, \dots, s)$;

b) $\eta^o(1, \dots, s) = (-1)^s \eta(s, s-1, \dots, 1)$;

c) *for indeterminates $X_1, \dots, X_s$,*

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant s_1 \leqslant s \\ \pi \in \Phi_{ss_1}}} (-1)^{s_1 - 1} X_{\pi^{-1}(1)} \dots X_{\pi^{-1}(s)} = [\dots [X_1, X_2], \dots, X_s].$$

Proof. a) It follows from the fact that all insertions of $(s_1, ..., 1)$ into $(s_1+1, \dots s)$ are "connected" and start either with s_1 or s_1+1.

b) Clearly, part a) implies that

$$\sum_{0 \leqslant s_1 \leqslant s} (-1)^{s_1} \eta(s_1, \dots, 1)\eta(s_1+1, \dots, s) = \delta_{0s}\,.$$

Then our statement follows from above relation (3.4).

c) Use that the right-hand side is a linear combintion of the monomials $X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_s}$ such that for any $l \geqslant 1$, $\{j \mid i_j \in [1, l]\}$ is a "connected" segment of consecutive l integers. □

3.3. **Solving congruences** (3.3)**.** Introduce the following notation:

— $\bar{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_s) \geqslant M$ means that for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant s$, $n_i \geqslant M$. Similarly, we interpret $\bar{n} > M$, $\bar{n} \leqslant M$ and $\bar{n} < M$.

— $\gamma(\bar{a}, \bar{n}) = a_1 p^{n_1} + \dots + a_s p^{n_s}$.

— For $1 \leqslant s_1 \leqslant s$, set $\gamma^*_{[s_1,s]}(\bar{a}, \bar{n}) = \sum_{s_1 \leqslant u \leqslant s} a_u p^{n^*_u}$ where $n^*_u = 0$ if $n^*_u = M(\bar{n}) := \max\{n_1, \dots, n_s\}$ and $n^* = -\infty$, otherwise (i.e. in this case $p^{n^*} = 0$).

— $\mathfrak{A}_1 = \{\iota \in \mathfrak{A} \mid \mathrm{ch}(\iota) = 1\}$.

— For $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1$ and $m \geqslant 0$, consider the following elements from the enveloping algebra $\mathcal{A}_k$ of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k$

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m] = \sum_{(\bar{a},\bar{n})} \sum_{1 \leqslant s_1 \leqslant s} \eta^o(1, \dots, s_1 - 1)\eta(s_1, \dots, s)\gamma^*_{[s_1,s]}(\bar{a}, \bar{n}) D_{(\bar{a},\bar{n})}\,.$$

Here the first sum is taken over all $(\bar{a}, \bar{n})$ of length $1 \leqslant s < p$ such that $\bar{n} \geqslant 0$, $m = M(\bar{n})$ and $\iota p^m = \gamma(\bar{a}, \bar{n}) - p^{M(\bar{n})} b^*$.

— Let $\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota]_0$ be a part of the above sum taken under the additional condition $m(\bar{n}) := \min\{n_1, \dots, n_s\} = 0$.

Note that for any $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1$ and $m \geqslant 0$,

$$\sigma^m \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota]_0 + \sigma^{m-1} \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p]_0 + \dots + \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0 = \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]\,.$$

In particular, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota] = \sum_{\iota',m} \sigma^m \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota']_0$ where the sum is taken over all $\iota' \in \mathfrak{A}_1$ and $m \geqslant 0$ such that $\iota' p^m = \iota$.

— $m(\iota) := \max\{m \mid \iota p^m \in \mathfrak{A}\} (= \max\{m \mid |ip^m| \leqslant (p-1)b^*\})$.

— $\mathfrak{A}_1^{\mathrm{prim}} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \setminus p\mathfrak{A}_1$. Note that $\mathfrak{A}_1^0(p) = \{\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^{\mathrm{prim}} \mid \iota > 0\}$.

Let $\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]}$ be the ideal in the enveloping algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ generated by the elements of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$.

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 1.1 introduce the ideals $\mathcal{J}(s)$, $s \geqslant 1$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in $\mathcal{A}$. Then for any $1 \leqslant s \leqslant p$, $\mathcal{J}(s) \supset \mathcal{J}^p$, $\mathcal{J}(s) \cap \bar{\mathcal{L}} = \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}} \cap \bar{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{N}$.

Clearly, the right hand side of (3.3) belongs to $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proposition 3.2. a) $c_0^1 \equiv \sum_{\iota,m} \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m] t^{-\iota p^m} \bmod (\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]} + \mathcal{J}(p))_{\mathcal{K}}$, *where the sum is taken over all* $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^{\mathrm{prim}}$ *and* $m \geqslant 0$;

b) *if* $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$, *then*

$$V_{\iota 0} \equiv -\sigma^{-m(\iota)} \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^{m(\iota)}] \bmod (\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]}\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]}) + \mathcal{J}(p))_k\,;$$

c) *If* $\mathrm{ch}(\iota) > 1$ *then* $V_{\iota 0} \in (\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]}\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]} + \mathcal{J}(p))_k$.

Proof. Apply induction on $1 \leqslant s_0 < p$ by assuming that a) holds with $\mathcal{J}(p)$ replaced by $\mathcal{J}(s_0)$ and deducing from this that a)-c) hold with $\mathcal{J}(p)$ replaced by $\mathcal{J}(s_0 + 1)$.

Clearly, a) holds with $s_0 = 1$.

Suppose $1 \leqslant s_0 < p$ and part a) holds modulo $(\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]} + \mathcal{J}(s_0))_{\mathcal{K}}$.

Let the right-hand side of (3.3) be $H = \sum_{\iota \in \mathfrak{A} \cup \{0\}} t^{-\iota} H_\iota$, where all $H_\iota \in \mathcal{J}_k$. Then $H \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}}$ implies that if $\iota > sb^*$ with $s < p$ then $H_\iota \in \mathcal{J}(s+1)_k$.

Deduce using (3.4) and the inductive assumption that

$$H \equiv -\sum_{\iota,m} \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0 t^{-\iota p^m} \bmod (\mathcal{J}(s_0 + 1) + \mathcal{J}^{[v_0]}\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]})_{\mathcal{K}}\,,$$

where the sum is taken over all $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^{\mathrm{prim}}$ and $m \geqslant 0$. Note that if $\iota p^m > (p-1)b^*$ then

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0 \in (\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]}\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]} + \mathcal{J}(s_0+1))_k\,. \tag{3.5}$$

Let $H = H^+ + H^-$, where H^+ and, resp., H^- are the partial sums with positive and, resp., negative powers of t.

Apply the operators $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ to recover c_0^1 and $\sum_{i\in\mathfrak{A}^0(p)} t^{-\iota}V_{\iota 0}$.

If $\iota < 0$ then $\mathcal{S}(\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0 t^{-\iota p^m}) = -\sum_{n\geqslant 0}\sigma^n\bar{\mathcal{F}}[p^m\iota]_0 t^{-\iota p^{n+m}}$ and, therefore, $\mathcal{S}(H^+) \equiv \sum_{\iota,m}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]t^{-\iota p^m}$, where the sum is taken over all $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^{\mathrm{prim}} \setminus \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$ and $m \geqslant 0$. This gives part a) modulo $\mathcal{J}(s_0+1)$ at the level of positive powers of t.

Let $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$. We obtain b) modulo $\mathcal{J}(s_0+1)$ as follows (use Lemma 2.12 and (3.5))

$$V_\iota t^{-\iota} \equiv -\mathcal{R}\left(\sum_{m\geqslant 0} t^{-\iota p^m}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0\right) \equiv -\mathcal{R}\left(\sum_{\iota p^m\in\mathfrak{A}} t^{-\iota p^m}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0\right) =$$

$$-t^{-\iota}\sum_{0\leqslant m\leqslant m(\iota)}\sigma^{-m}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0 = -t^{-\iota}\sigma^{-m(\iota)}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^{m(\iota)}]\,.$$

Finally, we have modulo the ideal $(\mathcal{J}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}) + \mathcal{J}(s_0+1))_{\mathcal{K}}$, where ι and m run over $\mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$ and, resp., $\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$:

$$\mathcal{S}(H^-) \equiv -\sum_{\iota,m}\mathcal{S}(t^{-\iota p^m}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0) \equiv -\sum_{\iota,m}\sum_{0\leqslant m_1<m} t^{-\iota p^{m_1}}\sigma^{-m+m_1}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0$$

$$\equiv -\sum_{\iota,m} t^{-\iota p^m}\sum_{m_1>m}\sigma^{-m_1+m}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^{m_1}]_0 \equiv -\sum_{\iota,m} t^{-\iota p^m}\sum_{\substack{m_1+m_2=m\\ m_2<0}}\sigma^{m_2}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^{m_1}]_0$$

$$\equiv \sum_{\iota,m} t^{-\iota p^m}\sum_{\substack{m_1+m_2=m\\ m_1,m_2\geqslant 0}}\sigma^{m_2}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^{m_1}]_0 = \sum_{\iota,m}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]t^{-\iota p^m}$$

because

$$\sum_{m_2+m_1=m}\sigma^{m_2}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^{m_1}]_0 = \bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m] \equiv \sigma^{m-m(\iota)}V_\iota \bmod (\mathcal{J}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]})+\mathcal{J}(s_0+1))_k\,.$$

Therefore, a)modulo $\mathcal{J}(s_0+1)$ is completely proved.

Property c) is obvious since the powers $t^{-\iota}$ with $\mathrm{ch}(\iota) \geqslant 2$ don't appear in the above calculations. □

3.4. **Relation to the elements $\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-N}$.** The above elements $\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]_0$ should belong to $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k$ but this is not clear from their explicit presentation in Subsection 3.3. The following proposition gives us such presentation and relates these elements to the elements $\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-N}$ defined in the Introduction.

Let $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-N}$ be the image of $\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-N}$ in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k$.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose* $\iota = qp^m\alpha - p^m b^* \in \mathfrak{A}_1$, *i.e.* $m \geqslant 0$, $p^m\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $|\iota| \leqslant b^*(p-1)$. *Then* $\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^n] = \sigma^{m+n}\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-(m+n)}$.

Proof. We have

$$\sigma^{-(m+n)}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^n] = \sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s_1\leqslant s<p\\(\bar{a},\bar{n})}} \eta^o(1,\dots,s_1-1)\eta(s_1,\dots,s)\gamma^*_{[s_1,s]}(\bar{a},\bar{n})D_{(\bar{a},\bar{n})}\,,$$

where the sum is taken along all $(\bar{a},\bar{n})$ such that $\max\{n_1,\dots,n_s\} = 0$, $\bar{n} \geqslant -(m+n)$ and $\gamma(\bar{a},\bar{n}) = \alpha$. By Lemma 3.1, $\eta^o(1,\dots,s_1-1) = (-1)^{s_1-1}\eta(s_1-1,\dots,1)$ and we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s_1\leqslant s<p\\(\bar{a},\bar{n})}} (-1)^{s_1-1}(B_{s_1-1}(1,\dots,s) + B_{s_1}(1,\dots,s))\gamma^*_{[s_1s]}(\bar{a},\bar{n})D_{(\bar{a}\bar{n})} =$$

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s_1\leqslant s<p\\(\bar{a},\bar{n})}} (-1)^{s_1-1}B_{s_1}(1,\dots,s)(\gamma^*_{s_1s}(\bar{a},\bar{n}) - \gamma^*_{s_1+1,s}(\bar{a},\bar{n}))D_{(\bar{a},\bar{n})} =$$

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s<p\\(\bar{a},\bar{n})}}\sum_{1\leqslant s_1\leqslant s} (-1)^{s_1-1}B_{s_1}(1,\dots,s)a_{s_1}p^{n^*_{s_1}}D_{(\bar{a}\bar{n})} =$$

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s<p\\(\bar{a},\bar{n})}}\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s_1\leqslant s\\ \pi\in\Phi_{ss_1}}} (-1)^{s_1-1}\eta(\pi(1),\dots,\pi(s))a_{s_1}p^{n^*_{s_1}}D_{(\bar{a},\bar{n})} =$$

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s<p\\(\bar{a},\bar{n})}} \eta(1,\dots,s)a_1 \sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s_1\leqslant s\\ \pi\in\Phi_{ss_1}}} (-1)^{s_1-1}D_{a_{\pi^{-1}(1)}n_{\pi^{-1}(1)}}\dots D_{a_{\pi^{-1}(s)}n_{\pi^{-1}(s)}} =$$

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant s<p\\(\bar{a},\bar{n})}} \eta(1,\dots,s)a_1[\dots[D_{a_1n_1}.D_{a_2n_2}],\dots,D_{a_sn_s}] = \bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-(m+n)}\,.$$

Proposition is proved. □

Corollary 3.4. a) $c_0^1 \equiv \sum_{\iota,m}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m]t^{-\iota p^m} \bmod \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}_{\mathcal{K}}$, *where the sum is taken over all* $i \in \mathfrak{A}_1^{\mathrm{prim}}$ *and* $m \geqslant 0$*;*

b) *if* $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$, *then* $V_{\iota 0} \equiv -\sigma^{-m(\iota)}\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^{m(\iota)}] \bmod [\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]},\bar{\mathcal{L}}]_k$;

c) *If* $\mathrm{ch}(\iota) > 1$ *then* $V_{\iota 0} \in [\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]},\bar{\mathcal{L}}]_k$.

Proof. By above proposition all $\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^m] \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_k$. It remains to apply Proposition 3.2 and to note that (use the Poincare-Birkhoff Theorem) $(\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]} + \mathcal{J}(p)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{L}} = \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ and $(\mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^{[v_0]} + \mathcal{J}^{[v_0]}\mathcal{J} + \mathcal{J}(p)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{L}} = [\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]},\bar{\mathcal{L}}]$. □

Corollary 3.5. *For any* $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$ *fix an integer* $m_\iota \geqslant m(\iota)$. *Then the ideal* $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ *is the minimal ideal in* $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ *such that* $\mathcal{L}_k^{[v_0]}$ *contains all* $\bar{\mathcal{F}}[\iota p^{m_\iota}]$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $\widetilde{N} = N^* - 1$. Then the ideal $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ is the minimal ideal in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k^{[v_0]}$ contains all $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-\widetilde{N}}$ with $\alpha \geqslant v_0$.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.5, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ is the minimal ideal such that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_k^{[v_0]}$ contains all $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-\widetilde{N}}$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ is such that

• there is $m \geqslant 0$ such that $\alpha \in A[p-1,m]$, cf. Subsection 2.1 for the definition of the set $A[m]$;

• $qp^m\alpha - p^m b^* \in \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$.

In particular, $\alpha > b^*/q = r^*(1-1/q) > v_0 - \delta_0$ and this implies that $\alpha \geqslant v_0$.

Therefore, it will be sufficient to prove that if α is arbitrary rational number such that $\alpha \geqslant v_0$ and $M \geqslant 0$ is such that $qp^{M+1}\alpha - p^{M+1}b^* > (p-1)b^*$ then $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-M} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$.

If $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-M} \neq 0$ then for some $a_1,\dots,a_s \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p)$, $a_1 \neq 0$, $0 = n_1 \geqslant n_2 \geqslant \dots \geqslant n_s \geqslant -M$ and $\alpha = a_1p^{n_1} + \dots + a_sp^{n_s}$. We can assume that all $a_i < (p-1)v_0$, because otherwise $\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-M} \in \mathcal{L}(p)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-M} = 0$. So, $\alpha \in A[p-1,M]$.

Use induction on $M \geqslant 0$.

If $M = 0$ then $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-M}$ is a linear combination of the terms of the form $[\dots[D_{a'_1 0}, D_{a'_2 0}], \dots, D_{a'_r 0}]$, where $a'_1 + \dots + a'_r = \alpha$. If $q\alpha - b^* > (p-1)b^*$ then $\alpha > (p-1)v_0$ and all such terms belong to $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(p) = 0$. Therefore, $q\alpha - b^* \leqslant (p-1)b^*$, i.e. $q\alpha - b^* \in \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-M} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$.

Suppose $M \geqslant 1$.

If $qp^M\alpha - p^M b^* = \iota p^m$ with $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$ then $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-M} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_k^{[v_0]}$ by Corollary 3.4. Otherwise, $qp^M\alpha - p^M b^* > b^*(p-1)$.

From definition it follows that $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha,-M}$ is a linear combination of the terms of the form

$$[\dots[\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha',-(M-1)}, D_{a'_1,-M}], \dots, D_{a'_r,-M}]$$

where $\alpha = \alpha' + (a'_1 + \dots + a'_r)/p^M$, $r \geqslant 0$, all $a'_i \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p)$ and $\alpha' \in A[p-1,M-1]$.

If $a'_1 + \dots + a'_r \geqslant (p-1)b^*/q$ then $a'_1 + \dots + a'_r \geqslant (p-1)v_0$, the whole term has weight $\geqslant p$ and, therefore, belongs to $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(p) = 0$.

Otherwise, the inequality

$$b^*(p-1)/p^M < q\alpha - b^* = q\alpha' - b^* + q(a'_1 + \dots + a'_r)/p^M$$

implies that $q\alpha' - b^* > 0$ and, therefore, $\alpha' \geqslant v_0$. It remains to prove that $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^0_{\alpha',-(M-1)} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$.

If $qp^M\alpha' - p^M b^* \leqslant (p-1)b^*$ then it follows from Corollary **??**. Otherwise, this follows from the inductive assumption. □

Corollary 3.7. *The ideal $\mathcal{L}^{[v_0]}$ is the minimal ideal in $\mathcal{L}$ such that $\mathcal{L}_k^{[v_0]}$ contains all $\mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-\widetilde{N}}$ with $\alpha \geqslant v_0$.*

Proof. It will be sufficient to prove that $\mathcal{L}(p)_k$ is contained in the ideal $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(v_0)$ of $\mathcal{L}_k$ generated by all $\sigma^n \mathcal{F}^0_{\alpha,-\widetilde{N}}$ with $\alpha \geqslant v_0$. This is straightforward calculation, cf. e.g. [8], Proposition 2.11, where we proved that for any $1 \leqslant s \leqslant p$,

$$\mathcal{L}(s)_k \subset \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(v_0) + C_s(\mathcal{L})_k\,. \tag{3.6}$$

□

4. Application to the ramification filtration

Due to Corollary 3.7, Theorem 0.1 is equivalent to the following statement:

Theorem 4.1. $\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} = \mathcal{L}^{[v_0]}$.

Similarly to paper [1] the proof of Theorem 4.1 will be given via studying the structure of $\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)}$ modulo the commutator ideals $C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L})$ by induction on $s_0 \geqslant 1$. The difference between the earlier and the recent approachs will be explained below.

4.1. **Auxiliary fields $\mathcal{K}'_\gamma$.** Our study of the ramification filtration in $\mathcal{G}$ substantially uses a construction of a totally ramified extension $\mathcal{K}'$ of $\mathcal{K}$ such that $[\mathcal{K}' : \mathcal{K}] = p^{N^*}$ and the Herbrand function $\varphi_{\mathcal{K}'/\mathcal{K}}$ has only one edge point (r^*, r^*). Recall that the parameters $N^* = N^*(v_0)$, $r^* = r^*(v_0)$, $q = p^{N^*}$, $b^* = r^*(q-1) \in \mathbb{Z}^+(p)$, etc. were defined in Section 2.

For a detailed explanation of the construction of $\mathcal{K}'$ cf. e.g. [3], Subsection 1.5. We just briefly recall that if $r^* = m/n$ with coprime natural numbers m and n, then $\mathcal{K}' = \mathcal{K}(U^n) \subset \mathcal{K}(u)(U)$, where $u^n = t$ and $U^q + r^* U = u^{-m}$. We can also apply the Hensel Lemma to choose a uniformizer t_1 in $\mathcal{K}'$ such that $t = t_1^q E(t_1^{b^*})^{-1}$. (Here $E(X) = \exp(X + X^p/p + \cdots + X^{p^n}/p^n + \dots) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[[X]]$ is the Artin-Hasse exponential.)

We need a slight generalization of the above construction of $\mathcal{K}'$.

For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}/p$, introduce the field $\mathcal{K}'_\gamma = k((t_\gamma))$ such that:

a) $[\mathcal{K}'_\gamma : \mathcal{K}] = q$;

b) $\varphi_{\mathcal{K}'_\gamma/\mathcal{K}}(x)$ has only one edge point at (r^*, r^*);

c) $\mathcal{K}'_\gamma = k((t_\gamma))$, where $t = t_\gamma^q E(\gamma t_\gamma^{b^*})^{-1}$.

The fields $\mathcal{K}'_\gamma$ appear in the same way as the field $\mathcal{K}'$. More precisely, $\mathcal{K}'_\gamma = \mathcal{K}(U_\gamma^n) \subset \mathcal{K}(u)(U_\gamma)$, where $u^n = t$ and $U_\gamma^q + \gamma r^* U_\gamma = u^{-m}$. Note that $\mathcal{K}'_\gamma$ is separable over $\mathcal{K}$ if $\gamma \neq 0$.

4.2. **The criterion.** Use the element $e \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the epimorphism $\eta_e = \pi_f(e) : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \longrightarrow G(\mathcal{L})$ from Subsection 1.3.

Suppose $\gamma \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{K}'_\gamma$ is the field from Subsection 4.1. Consider the field isomorphism $\iota_\gamma : \mathcal{K} \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}'_\gamma$ such that $\iota_\gamma : t \mapsto t_\gamma$ and $\iota_\gamma|_k = \mathrm{id}_k$. Let $e_\gamma = (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{L}} \otimes \iota_\gamma)e$. Then (use that $N^* \equiv 0 \bmod N_0$)

$$\widetilde{\exp}\, e_\gamma \equiv 1 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant s < p \\ a_1,\dots,a_s \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p)}} \eta(a_1,\dots,a_s) t_\gamma^{-(a_1+\dots+a_s)} D_{a_1 0} \dots D_{a_s 0} \bmod J^p_{\mathcal{K}'_\gamma}\,.$$

Clearly, $\sigma^{N^*} e_\gamma(t_\gamma) = e(t_\gamma^q)$.

Choose $f_\gamma \in \mathcal{F}(e_\gamma)$ and consider $\pi_{f_\gamma}(e_\gamma) : \mathrm{Gal}(\mathcal{K}_{sep}/\mathcal{K}'_\gamma) \longrightarrow G(\mathcal{L})$.

For $Y \in \mathcal{L}_{sep}$ and an ideal $\mathcal{I}$ in $\mathcal{L}$, define the field of definition of $Y \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep}$ over, say, $\mathcal{K}$ as

$$\mathcal{K}(Y \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep}) := \mathcal{K}_{sep}^{\mathcal{H}}\,,$$

where $\mathcal{H} = \{g \in \mathcal{G} \mid (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{L}} \otimes g)Y \equiv Y \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep}\}$.

For any finite field extension $\mathcal{E}'/\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathcal{K}_{sep}$, define its biggest ramification number $v(\mathcal{E}'/\mathcal{E}) = \max\{v \mid \mathrm{Gal}(\mathcal{K}_{sep}/\mathcal{E})^{(v)} \text{acts non-trivially on } \mathcal{E}'\}$.

The methods from [1, 2, 3] are based on the following criterion.

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose $\gamma \neq 0$ and $f = X_\gamma \circ \sigma^{N^*}(f_\gamma)$. Then $\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)}$ is the minimal ideal in the family of all ideals $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ such that*

$$v(\mathcal{K}'_\gamma(X_\gamma \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep})/\mathcal{K}'_\gamma) < qv_0 - b^*.$$

The proof for any $\gamma \neq 0$ goes along the lines of the proof for $\gamma = 1$, cf. e.g. [3], Subsection 1.6. It is based just on the following elementary properties of upper ramification numbers:

— if $v = v(\mathcal{K}(f \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep})/\mathcal{K})$ then:

- $v(\mathcal{K}'_\gamma(f_\gamma \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep})/\mathcal{K}'_\gamma) = v$;
- $v(\mathcal{K}'_\gamma(f_\gamma \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep})/\mathcal{K}) = \varphi_{\mathcal{K}'_\gamma/\mathcal{K}}(v)$;
- if $v > r^*$ then $\varphi_{\mathcal{K}'_\gamma/\mathcal{K}}(v) = r^* + (v - r^*)/q < v$.

Note that $f = X_\gamma \circ \sigma^{N^*} f_\gamma$ implies that $e(t) = \sigma X_\gamma \circ \sigma^{N^*} e_\gamma \circ (-X_\gamma)$.

Inversely, suppose $X \in \mathcal{L}_{sep}$ and

$$e(t) = \sigma X \circ \sigma^{N^*} e_\gamma \circ (-X)\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Then $l = (-\sigma^{N^*} f_\gamma) \circ (-X) \circ f \in \mathcal{L}_{sep}|_{\sigma=\mathrm{id}} = \mathcal{L}$ and replacing f_γ by $f_\gamma \circ l \in \mathcal{F}(e_\gamma)$ we obtain $f = X \circ \sigma^{N^*} f_\gamma$. Therefore, in Proposition 4.2 we can use identity (4.1) instead of the identity $f = X_\gamma \circ \sigma^{N^*} f_\gamma$.

Note that for any γ there is a unique field isomorphism $\iota_\gamma : \mathcal{K}'_\gamma \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}$ such that $\iota_\gamma(t_\gamma) = t$ and $\iota_\gamma|_k = \mathrm{id}$. Therefore, if we set $\sigma^{N^*} e = e^{(q)}$ and $e(t^q E(\gamma t^{b^*})^{-1}) = \Omega_\gamma e^{(q)}$ then Proposition 4.2 can be stated in the following equivalent way.

Proposition 4.3. *If $\gamma \neq 0$ and $X_\gamma \in \mathcal{L}_{sep}$ is such that*

$$\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)} = \sigma X_\gamma \circ e^{(q)} \circ (-X_\gamma)$$

then $\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)}$ is the minimal ideal in the set of all ideals $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ such that

$$v(\mathcal{K}(X_\gamma \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep})/\mathcal{K}) < qv_0 - b^* .$$

Suppose $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{L}$ is a closed ideal and $\pi : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow L := \mathcal{L}/\mathcal{J}$ is a natural projection. Then we can use $e_L = \pi_{\mathcal{K}}(e) \in L_{\mathcal{K}}$, $f_L := \pi_{sep}(f) \in L_{sep}$, $\eta_{e_L} = \pi\eta_e : \mathcal{G}_{<p} \longrightarrow G(L)$ and $X_{\gamma L} := \pi_{sep}(X_\gamma)$ to state the following analogue of Proposition 4.3.

Proposition 4.4. *$L^{(v_0)} := \eta_L(\mathcal{G}^{(v_0)})$ is the minimal ideal in the set of all ideals $\mathcal{I}$ of L such that $v(\mathcal{K}(X_{\gamma L} \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep})/\mathcal{K}) < qv_0 - b^*$.*

4.3. **Inductive assumption.** We are going to prove Theorem 4.1 by induction on $s_0 \geqslant 1$ in the folowing form

$$\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{L}^{[v_0]} + C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L}) . \tag{4.2}$$

It is obviously true for $s_0 = 1$.

Suppose it holds for some $1 \leqslant s_0 < p$.

Proposition 4.5. *For $\gamma \neq 0$, there is $x_\gamma \in t^{b^*} \sum_{1 \leqslant s < s_0} t^{-sb^*} \mathcal{L}(s)_{\mathrm{m}}$ such that $X_\gamma \equiv x_\gamma \bmod (\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L}))_{sep}$.*

Proof. Applying $\mathcal{V}_{sep}$ to $\Omega_\gamma \bar{f}^\dagger$, cf. (2.1), we obtain in $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_{sep}$ the following identity

$$\Omega_\gamma(\bar{f}^{(q)}) = \mathcal{V}(\bar{c}_\gamma) \circ (\mathcal{V}A^\dagger_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id})\bar{f}^\dagger .$$

Note that:

1) $\mathcal{V}(\bar{c}_\gamma) \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger(1)) = \bar{\mathcal{N}}(1)$;

2) $(\mathcal{V}A^\dagger_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id})\bar{f}^\dagger \equiv \bar{f}^{(q)} \bmod \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}_{sep}$ (use the definition of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$);

3) $\Omega_\gamma(\bar{f}^{(q)}) = \Omega_\gamma(f^{(q)}) \bmod \mathcal{L}(p)_{sep}$;

4) $\mathcal{L}^{[v_0]} \subset \mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L})$ (use inductive assumption).

Therefore,

$$\Omega_\gamma(f^{(q)}) \equiv x_\gamma \circ f^{(q)} \bmod (\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L}))_{sep} ,$$

where $x_\gamma \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is such that $x_\gamma \bmod \mathcal{N}(p) = \mathcal{V}(\bar{c}_\gamma)$.

It remains to note that since $\bar{c}_\gamma \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^\dagger(1)) = \bar{\mathcal{N}}(1)$ and $\mathcal{L}(s_0) \subset \mathcal{L}^{[v_0]} + C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L})$, cf (3.6), we can assume that $x_\gamma \in t^{b^*} \sum_{1 \leqslant s < s_0} t^{-sb^*} \mathcal{L}(s)_{\mathrm{m}} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}}(1)$. Proposition is proved. □

For non-commuting variables x and y, let $\delta^0(x, y) := x \circ y - (x + y)$. Note that if x and y are defined modulo $C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L})_{sep}$ then $\delta^0(x, y)$ is well-defined modulo $C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L})_{sep}$.

Lemma 4.6. *For any* $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}/p \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\sigma X_\gamma - X_\gamma \equiv y_\gamma \bmod ([\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)}, \mathcal{L}] + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L}))_{sep}\,,$$

where $y_\gamma = \Omega_\gamma e^{(q)} - e^{(q)} + \delta^0(\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)}, x_\gamma) - \delta^0(\sigma x_\gamma, e^{(q)})$.

Proof of lemma. Use that $\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)} \circ X_\gamma = \sigma X_\gamma \circ e^{(q)}$ and

$$\delta^0(\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)}, X_\gamma) \equiv \delta^0(\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)}, x_\gamma) \bmod ([\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)}, \mathcal{L}] + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L}))_{sep}\,,$$

$$\delta^0(\sigma X_\gamma, e^{(q)}) \equiv \delta^0(\sigma x_\gamma, e^{(q)}) \bmod ([\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)}, \mathcal{L}] + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L}))_{sep}\,.$$

□

The element y_γ can be uniquely written as

$$y_\gamma = \sum_{\substack{m \geqslant 0 \\ a \in \mathbb{Z}^+(p)}} t^{-ap^m} l_{am} + l_O\,,$$

where all $l_{am} \in \mathcal{L}_k$ and $l_O \in \mathcal{L}_O$. Then by Proposition 4.4 the ideal $\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L})$ appears as the minimal ideal in the set of all ideals $\mathcal{I}$ such that:

— $\mathcal{I} \supset [\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)}, \mathcal{L}] + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L})$;

— if $a \geqslant qv_0 - b^*$ then $l^{(a)} := \sum_{m \geqslant 0} \sigma^{-m} l_{am} \in \mathcal{I}_k$.

Remark. When following this strategy we could work with just one index γ (say, $\gamma = 1$), then use very precise inductive assumptions about generators of $\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0}(\mathcal{L})$ and highly non-trivial computations with Campbell-Hausdorff composition law. This idea was realised in [1, 3]. In this paper we achieve the result by applying the properties of the deformation $\mathcal{L}^\dagger$ of $\mathcal{L}$ from Section 3.

Proposition 4.7. $\mathcal{L}(s_0 + 1) \subset \mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L})$. *Equivalently, if* $a \geqslant s_0 v_0$ *then* $D_{an} \in \mathcal{L}_k^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L})_k$.

Proof. Proceeding similarly to Lemma 1.1 obtain that $e^{(q)}, \Omega_\gamma e^{(q)} \in \mathcal{N}_\mathcal{L}$. Clearly, $\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)} - e^{(q)} \in \mathcal{N}_\mathcal{L}(1)$.

Therefore, y_γ is congruent to $\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)} - e^{(q)}$ modulo

$$[\mathcal{N}_\mathcal{L}(1), \mathcal{N}_\mathcal{L}] \subset \mathcal{N}_\mathcal{L}(1) \cap C_2(\mathcal{L})_\mathcal{K} \subset$$

$$\subset \sum_{2 \leqslant s_1 + s_2 \leqslant s_0} [\mathcal{L}(s_1), \mathcal{L}(s_2)]_{\mathrm{m}} t^{-(s_1+s_2-1)b^*} + \mathcal{L}(s_0+1)_\mathcal{K} \cap C_2(\mathcal{L})_\mathcal{K}$$

$$\subset t^{-(s_0-1)b^*} \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{m}} + (\mathcal{L}(s_0+1) \cap C_2(\mathcal{L}))_\mathcal{K}.$$

Lemma 4.8. $\mathcal{L}(s_0 + 1) \cap C_2(\mathcal{L}) \subset \mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} \cap C_2(\mathcal{L})$.

Proof of lemma. From the definition of $\mathcal{L}(s_0+1)$ it follows that the k-module $\mathcal{L}(s_0+1)_k \cap C_2(\mathcal{L})_k$ is generated by all commutators of the form $[\dots[D_{a_1n_1}, D_{a_2n_2}], \dots, D_{a_rn_r}]$ such that $r \geqslant 2$ and $\mathrm{wt}(D_{a_1n_1}) + \dots + \mathrm{wt}(D_{a_rn_r}) \geqslant s_0+1$. Here for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$, $\mathrm{wt}(D_{a_in_i}) = s_i$, where $(s_i-1)v_0 \leqslant a_i < s_iv_0$. Using that $r \geqslant 2$, we obtain that if $s_i' := \min\{s_i, s_0\}$ then $\sum_i s_i' \geqslant s_0+1$. By inductive assumption all $D_{a_in_i} \in \mathcal{L}(s_i')_k \subset \mathcal{L}_k^{(v_0)} + C_{s_i'}(\mathcal{L})_k$ and therefore the commutator $[\dots[D_{a_1n_1}, D_{a_2n_2}], \dots, D_{a_rn_r}]$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}_k^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L})_k$. This implies the statement of our lemma. □

This lemma implies that if $a \geqslant (s_0-1)b^*$ then $l^{(a)} \bmod (\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} \cap C_2(\mathcal{L}))_k$ appears only as a linear combination of the appropriate (linear!) terms of $\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)} - e^{(q)}$. More precisely, we can state this as follows.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\Omega_\gamma e^{(q)} - e^{(q)} = \sum \alpha(a',u)t^{-qa'+ub^*}D_{a'0}$ where a' and u run over, resp., $\mathbb{Z}^+(p)$ and $\mathbb{N}$ and all $\alpha(a',u) \in \mathbb{F}_p$ (note $\alpha(a',1) = a'$). If $a \geqslant (s_0-1)b^*$ then*

$$l^{(a)} \equiv \sum_{\substack{m\geqslant 0 \\ qa'-ub^*=ap^m}} \alpha(a',u)D_{a',-m} \bmod (\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} \cap C_2(\mathcal{L}))_k\,.$$

Suppose $a \in \mathbb{Z}^0(p)$ and $a \geqslant s_0v_0$. This implies that $qa \geqslant (s_0-1)b^*$, $a = qa_0 - b^* \geqslant (s_0-1)b^*$ and

$$l^{(a)} = a_0D_{a_00} + \{k\text{-(pro)linear combination of } D_{a'm'} \text{ with } a' > a_0\}$$

Since all such $l^{(a)}$ belong to $\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L})$ it implies that all D_{a_00} with $a_0 \geqslant s_0$ (or, equivalently, with the weight $\geqslant s_0+1$) must belong to $(\mathcal{L}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0+1}(\mathcal{L}))_k$. □

4.4. **Interpretation in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$.** It remains to prove that in $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ we have that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)} + C_{s_0+1}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + C_{s_0+1}(\bar{\mathcal{L}})$. Equivalently, we can use our inductive assumption in the form $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0)$ and must prove that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0+1) = \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0+1)$.

In Section 3 we obtained that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0+1)$ is the minimal ideal in the set of all ideals $\mathcal{I}$ of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ such that :

- $\mathcal{I} \supset \mathcal{I}^* := [\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}, \bar{\mathcal{L}}] + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0+1)$;
- if $\iota = qp^m\alpha - p^mb^* \in \mathfrak{A}_1^0(p)$ with $\alpha \geqslant v_0$, then $\mathcal{V}B^\dagger(D_{\iota 0}^\dagger) \in \mathcal{I}_k$;
- if $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0(p)$ with $\mathrm{ch}(\iota) > 1$ then $\mathcal{V}B^\dagger(D_{\iota 0}^\dagger) \in \mathcal{I}_k$.

From (2.2) it follows that

$$(-\mathcal{V}(\bar{c}_\gamma)) \circ \bar{X}_\gamma \equiv \mathcal{V}_{sep}(A_\gamma^\dagger \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{f}^\dagger \circ (-\mathcal{V}_{sep}\bar{f}^\dagger) \equiv$$

$$(\mathcal{V}A_\gamma^\dagger \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{f}^\dagger \circ (-\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{f}^\dagger \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep}^*\,.$$

Proposition 4.10. *For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$,*

a) $\mathcal{V}A^\dagger_\gamma(l) \equiv \mathcal{V}l \bmod \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0)$;

b) $A^\dagger_\gamma(\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{V}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}) + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s_0)$;

c) $B^\dagger(\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathcal{V}^{-1}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}) + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s_0)$.

Proof. Suppose $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\eta_{\bar{e}^\dagger}(\tau) = l_\tau \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$, i.e. $\tau\bar{f}^\dagger = \bar{f}^\dagger \circ (l_\tau \otimes 1)$. Then we have:

$$\tau\bar{X}_\gamma = \mathcal{V}(\bar{c}_\gamma) \circ \mathcal{V}_{sep}(A^\dagger_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id})\tau\bar{f}^\dagger \circ (-\mathcal{V}_{sep}\tau\bar{f}^\dagger)$$

$$= \mathcal{V}(\bar{c}_\gamma) \circ \mathcal{V}_{sep}(A^\dagger_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id})\bar{f}^\dagger \circ (l'_\tau \otimes 1) \circ (-\mathcal{V}_{sep}\bar{f}^\dagger)\,,$$

where $l'_\tau := \mathcal{V}A^\dagger_\gamma(l_\tau) \circ (-\mathcal{V}l_\tau) = \mathcal{V}(A^\dagger_\gamma(l_\tau) \circ (-l_\tau))$.

From Proposition 4.5 we know that for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}/p$,

$$\mathcal{K}(\bar{X}_\gamma \bmod (\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0))_{sep}) = \mathcal{K}\,.$$

Therefore, for any $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$, $\mathcal{V}A^\dagger_\gamma(l) \equiv \mathcal{V}l \bmod \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0)$. This proves part a). In particular, if $l \in \mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V}$ then $\mathcal{V}A^\dagger_\gamma(l) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0)$ and this is equivalent to the statement b) from our proposition.

Part b) implies c) because for any $l \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$ we have a non-degenerate system of linear relations

$$(A^\dagger_\gamma - \mathrm{id}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger})l \equiv \sum_{1 \leqslant s < p} \gamma^s B^{\dagger s}(l)/s! \bmod \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s_0) \tag{4.3}$$

with $\gamma = 1, \dots, p-1$.

Finally, note that vice versa, c) implies that for all $s \geqslant 0$, $B^{\dagger s}(\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V}) \subset \mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger(s_0)$ and relations (4.3) imply b).

Proposition is proved. □

Part a) of the above proposition implies that

$$(\mathcal{V}A^\dagger_\gamma \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{f}^\dagger \equiv (\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{f}^\dagger \bmod (\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0))_{sep}\,,$$

and, therefore,

$$(-\mathcal{V}\bar{c}_\gamma) \circ \bar{X}_\gamma \equiv (\mathcal{V}(A^\dagger_\gamma - \mathrm{id}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}}) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{f}^\dagger \bmod \mathcal{I}^*_{sep} \tag{4.4}$$

Proposition 4.11. *The following properties of an ideal $\mathcal{I} \supset \mathcal{I}^*$ of the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ are equivalent:*

a) *for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}/p$, $v(\mathcal{K}(\bar{X}_\gamma \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep})/\mathcal{K}) < qv_0 - b^*$;*

b) *for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}/p$ and $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)$ such that $\iota p^{-v_p(\iota)} \geqslant qv_0 - b^*$, we have $A^\dagger_\gamma(D_{\iota 0}) - D_{\iota 0} \in (\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{I})_k$;*

c) *for any $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0_1(p)$ such that $\iota p^{-v_p(\iota)} \geqslant qv_0 - b^*$, we have*

$$B^\dagger(D_{\iota 0}) \in (\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{I})_k\,.$$

Proof. Relation (4.4) implies that

$$\mathcal{K}(\bar{X}_\gamma \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep}) = \mathcal{K}(\bar{Z}_\gamma \bmod \mathcal{I}_{sep})\,,$$

where $\bar{Z}_\gamma = (\mathcal{V}(A_\gamma^\dagger - \mathrm{id}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger}) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{f}^\dagger$.

By Proposition 4.10, $\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{V}(A_\gamma^\dagger - \mathrm{id}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0)$. Therefore, $\bar{Z}_\gamma \mathrm{mod} \mathcal{I}^*_{sep}$ belongs to the abelian group $G((\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} + \bar{\mathcal{L}}(s_0))_{sep}) \bmod G(\mathcal{I}^*_{sep})$. Using $\sigma\bar{f}^\dagger = \bar{e}^\dagger \circ \bar{f}^\dagger$ we obtain the following relations modulo $\mathcal{I}^*_{sep}$:

$$\sigma\bar{Z}_\gamma \equiv (\mathcal{V}A_\gamma^\dagger \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{e}^\dagger \circ \bar{Z}_\gamma \circ (-\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}_{sep}})\bar{e}_L^\dagger \equiv$$

$$(\mathcal{V}(A_\gamma^\dagger - \mathrm{id}_{L^\dagger}) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}})\bar{e}^\dagger \circ \bar{Z}_\gamma \equiv (\mathcal{V}(A_\gamma^\dagger - \mathrm{id}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger}) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{K}})\bar{e}^\dagger + \bar{Z}_\gamma\,.$$

In other words, we obtained standard Artin-Schreier equations

$$\sigma\bar{Z}_\gamma - \bar{Z}_\gamma \equiv \sum_{\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)} t^{-\iota}\mathcal{V}(A_\gamma^\dagger - \mathrm{id}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger})D_{\iota 0}\,.$$

This proves the implication a)⇒b), because:

1) if $\sigma z_\iota - z_\iota = t^{-\iota}l_\iota$, where $l_\iota \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_k \setminus \{0\}$, then for the biggest ramification number we have $v(\mathcal{K}(z_\iota)/\mathcal{K}) = \iota p^{-v_p(\iota)} = q\alpha - b^* > 0$ and this implies automatically that $\alpha \geqslant v_0$;

2) by Proposition 2.8 all prime to p integers $\iota p^{-v_p(\iota)}$, where ι runs over the set $\mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)$, are different.

It is easy to see that we can move in the opposite direction and deduce a) from b).

The implication b)⇒c) is provided by the following relations

$$A_\gamma = \mathrm{id}_{\bar{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger} + \sum_{1 \leqslant m < p} \gamma^m B^{\dagger m}/m!$$

(use that the corresponding Vandermond matrix is invertible). Indeed, these relations together with b) imply that $\mathcal{V}B^\dagger(D^\dagger_{\iota 0}) \in (\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{I})_k$ if $\iota p^{-v_p(\iota)} \geqslant qv_0 - b^*$. But we have proved in Section 3 that this implies that $\mathcal{V}B^\dagger(D_{\iota 0}) \in (\mathrm{Ker}\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{I})_k$ for all ι with $\mathrm{ch}(\iota) = 1$ and, therefore, it holds for all $\iota \in \mathfrak{A}^0_{\geqslant 1}(p)$.

The above relations also provide us with the implication c)⇒b) (use that if $B^\dagger$ satisfies c) then any power of $B^\dagger$ also satisfies c)). □

As a result, we proved that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)} \bmod \mathcal{I}^* = \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]} \bmod \mathcal{I}^*$.

Therefore, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^{(v_0)} = \bar{\mathcal{L}}^{[v_0]}$ and Theorem 4.1 is completely proved.

References

[1] V.A.Abrashkin, *Ramification filtration of the Galois group of a local field*, Proceedings of the St. Petersburg Mathematical Society III, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, (1995) **166**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI

[2] V.A. Abrashkin, *Ramification filtration of the Galois group of a local field. II*, Proceedings of Steklov Math. Inst. **208** (1995)

[3] V.Abrashkin, *Ramification filtration of the Galois group of a local field. III*, Izvestiya RAN: Ser. Mat., **62**, no.5 (1998), 3-48; English transl. Izvestiya: Mathematics **62**, no.5, 857–900

[4] V.Abrashkin *On a local analogue of the Grothendieck Conjecture* Int. J. Math., **11** (2000), no.1, 3-43

[5] V.Abrashkin *Modified proof of a local analogue of the Grothendieck Conjecture* J.Théor. Nombres Bordeaux, **22** (2010), no.1, 1-50

[6] V.Abrashkin, R.Jenni *The field-of-norms functor and the Hilbert symbol for higher local fields* J.Théor. Nombres Bordeaux, **24** (2012), no.1, 1-39

[7] V.Abrashkin, *Galois groups of local fields, Lie algebras and ramification*, Arithmetic and Geometry, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series: **420**, Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp.1-23

[8] V.Abrashkin, Automorphisms of local fields of period p and nilpotent class $< p$. (arXiv:1403.4121)

[9] J.-M.Fontaine, *Representations p-adiques des corps locaux (1-ere partie).* In: The Grothendieck Festschrift, A Collection of Articles in Honor of the 60th Birthday of Alexander Grothendieck, vol. II, 1990, 249-309

[10] M. Hall The theory of groups, The Macmillan Company New York, 1959

[11] E.I. Khukhro, *p-automorphisms of finite p-groups.* London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, **246**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. xviii+204 pp.

[12] M. Lazard, *Sur les groupes nilpotents et les anneaux de Lie*, Ann. Ecole Norm. Sup. (1954) **71**, 101-190

[13] J.-P. Serre Local fields, Berlin, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1959

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Durham University, Science Laboratories, South Rd, Durham DH1 3LE, United Kingdom & Steklov Institute, Gubkina str. 8, 119991, Moscow, Russia

E-mail address: victor.abrashkin@durham.ac.uk